DIE FRAGMENTE DER GRIECHISCHEN HISTORIKER CONTINUED

Felix Jacoby

BRILL

FELIX JACOBY

DIE FRAGMENTE DER GRIECHISCHEN HISTORIKER

CONTINUED

This page intentionally left blank

FELIX JACOBY

DIE FRAGMENTE

DER

GRIECHISCHEN HISTORIKER

CONTINUED

PART FOUR

BIOGRAPHY AND ANTIQUARIAN LITERATURE

EDITED BY

G. SCHEPENS

IV A: BIOGRAPHY

FASCICLE 1

THE PRE-HELLENISTIC PERIOD

BY

J. BOLLANSÉE — J. ENGELS — G. SCHEPENS — E. THEYS

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
1998

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

(Revised for vol. 3)

Jacoby, Felix, 1876-1959.
Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.

Includes bibliographical references.
Contents: — 2. T . Zeitgeschichte. B. Spezialgeschichten, Autorenbiographien und Memoiren, Zeittafeln — 3. Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie). A. B. Autoren ueber verschiedene Staedte (Laender), Nr. 262-607.
1. Lost literature—Greece. 2. Transmission of texts. 3. History, Ancient. 4. Greece—History. I. Title.
PA3490.J3 1993 938 92-37718
ISBN 90-04-11094-1 (v. 2, pt. B)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Jacoby, Felix:
Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker continued / Felix Jacoby.
Ed. by G. Schepens. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Pt. 4. Biography and antiquarian literature
A. Biography
Fasc. 1. The pre-Hellenistic period / by J. Bollansée … – 1998
ISBN 90–04–11094–1

ISBN 90 04 11094 1

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

PROLEGOMENA

On his death in 1959, Felix Jacoby left incomplete the original plan for his massive and now standard edition and commentary, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Jacoby had managed to complete the first three parts out of the six he had planned, namely (I) *Genealogy and Mythography*, (II) *Zeitgeschichte* (Jacoby's idiosyncratic term for the most prominent genre, viz. political-military history), and (III) *Horography* and *Ethnography*: together 17 sizable volumes, dealing with 856 consecutively numbered authors, published between 1923 and 1958[1]. The present fascicle containing biographical fragments from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. is the first in a series of eight, which will provide a critical edition, with English translation and commentary, of all extant fragments concerning ancient Greek *Biography*. This project is merely part of a wider undertaking, designed to cover the fragmentary remains from several fields of writing more in the domain of ancient Greek *History of Literature* and *Antiquarianism*.

Ten years ago, Prof. G.-A. Lehmann (formerly Cologne, now Göttingen) availed himself of the opportunity provided by his concluding address to the international colloquium on the «Purposes of History» (Leuven, 24-26 May 1988) to plead the case for resuming work on Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* without delay[2]. The appeal began to bear fruit when, in February 1991, a small research team consisting, at the time, of G.-A. Lehmann, Dr. J. Engels (Cologne), Dr. J. Bollansée (Leuven) and myself, gathered for the first time to discuss a concrete plan for setting to work on the continuation-project. Initially, we agreed on a relatively limited plan, concentrating on the fragments of Greek political, literary and philosophical biography. The other branches of antiquarian literature which Jacoby had considered for inclusion in his 'Werkteil IV', would be addressed, so we assumed, at a later stage. However, as my collaborator

[1] As the achievement of a single scholar, the *FGrHist*, even as a torso, ranks as one of the greatest realizations, if not the greatest outright, in the domain of Classical Philology in the 20th century. See E. Mensching, *Texte zur Berliner Philologie-Geschichte, VI. Felix Jacoby (1876-1959) und Berliner Institutionen 1934-1939*, in *Nugae zur Philologie-Geschichte* II, Berlin 1989, p. 5-59.

[2] *Schlußbetrachtung*, in H. Verdin – G. Schepens – E. de Keyser (ed.), *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the Second Centuries B.C.* (Studia Hellenistica 30), Leuven 1990, p. 370-371.

J. Bollansée set out to draw up a first, provisional list of authors and titles to be incorporated in the collection of Greek biographical fragments, it soon became clear that in order even to assemble all relevant data it would be necessary to take more than an incidental look at the other materials. The close relationship of ancient Greek 'biography' to various other forms of 'Antiquarianism', indeed, in some cases, its position midway between several literary genres, made it impossible to divorce a study of the biographical fragments from the other sections envisaged for *FGrHist* IV. How, for instance, were we to draw a dividing line (if any) between literary biography, on the one hand, and works in the field of the 'history of literature' on the other, especially in the many instances of works which seem to represent some idiosyncratic mixture of the two? Again, should not a work like Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τυράννων be catalogued under "historical collections" rather than mentioned, alongside many works on ἔνδοξοι, as some form of collective biography?

Faced with such questions, we were keen to check our provisional lists and our tentative ideas for the distribution of all antiquarian material in the various categories, against the preparatory notes Jacoby had left for this part of his *magnum opus*. Prof. em. H. Bloch (Harvard University) was kind enough to make the relevant portion of Jacoby's *Nachlass* available to the continuation-team. The team expanded into a much larger working group, as our initial, relatively 'modest' biography-project shaped into a considerably wider undertaking, involving the full programme originally drawn up by Jacoby for *FGrHist* IV: Prof. A. Henrichs (Harvard University), who in June 1992 brought back to Europe a microfilm and a photocopied set of the Jacoby-papers, was the first to join our ranks, which further increased as Prof. K. Brodersen (Mannheim), Dr. hab. Eveline Krummen (Zürich/Bern), Prof. H.-G. Nesselrath (Bern) and Dr. J. Radicke (Göttingen) committed themselves to our cause. As a fortunate consequence of parallel initiatives developed independently of our own project, an international venture is now underway to complete *FGrHist*, or at least the most important parts thereof, more or less according to the original plan established in 1922[3]. Part V, on historical geography, which had been cancelled because of the death in 1964 of Friedrich Gisinger[4], is again part of the programme: the edition, translation of and commentary on the fragments concerning

---

[3] See F. Jacoby, *Vorrede* to *FGrHist* I (Berlin 1923), p. V.

[4] See H. Bloch, *Problems in Editing Fragments of Greek Historians*, in W. Schmid (ed.), *Die Interpretation in der Altertumswissenschaft*, Bonn 1971, p. 112-113.

historical geography is to be co-ordinated by a working group of the Ernst-Kirsten-Gesellschaft, comprising H.-J. Gehrke (Freiburg), P. Funke (Münster), E. Olshausen (Stuttgart) and F. Prontera (Perugia). At the same time Prof. Ch. W. Fornara is undertaking the task of publishing an updated version of the text left behind by Jacoby for the commentary on *FGrHist* IIIC (Autoren über einzelne Länder. Nr. 608a-856)[5].

The Jacoby-papers made available to us consist of an 'Entwurf', i.e. a general plan for part IV, and some 1.000 'Zettel' registering data (references to the sources of the fragments and some bibliographical information) on individual authors. The few comments, written in a distinctively telegrammatic style, are rather unevenly spread over the document as a whole. The scholarly interest of these observations is unquestionable, especially when they express Jacoby's own perplexity at the obscurity or ambiguity of much of the evidence. They cannot, however, be considered to amount to a proper commentary. For this reason, references to the views expressed in the *Nachlass* will be duly made whenever this seems appropriate, but we do not, as a rule, intend to provide a complete transcription of Jacoby's text (unlike Fornara, who integrates Jacoby's more ample, sometimes nearly finished notes in German into his commentary to *FGrHist* 608a-665).

What strikes the reader most, perhaps, in regard to Jacoby's comments as a whole, is the still very unsettled state of affairs, which leaves us, in fact, with more questions unsolved than clarified. In Jacoby's 'Entwurf' the authors and / or work titles to be dealt with in *FGrHist* IV are distributed over no less than 24 categories or rubrics (some of them with titles in Greek, others in German). At one stage he even considers creating more and 'kleinere abschnitte'. Jacoby stresses, repeatedly, the provisional character of the 'lists', and we do not know how he would, eventually, have arranged the numerous and diverse materials—amounting to over six hundred items—for final publication. Admittedly, the problems that emerge from his tentative use of so many rubrics are for the greater part irreducibly related to the many types of works to be collected and arranged under the aggregate term "Biography, History of Literature and Antiquarian Literature'. But at least some of the perplexing difficulties may be laid at Jacoby's own door, as they appear directly linked to his broad definition of 'history'—encompassing "virtually all forms of

[5] The first fascicle, out of a projected total of eight, has appeared: Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIC, Fascicle 1: *Commentary on Nos. 608a-608,* Leiden - New York - Köln 1994.

non-fiction prose writing"[6]—and to his *genos*-oriented approach, predicated on an early twentieth-century understanding of 'philologico-antiquarian literature', which, needless to say, does not quite match the definitions or practices of Hellenistic *philologoi*[7]. In this connection I may refer the reader to my general presentation of the continuation project in "*Jacoby's* FGrHist: *Problems, Methods, Prospects*"[8]. Besides arguing why *FGrHist* deserves to be continued, this paper touches on the many and varied problems involved in taking over such a large-scale project, it evokes the methodological issues connected with the selection and categorization of the materials, and suggests, in regard to the final layout of FGrHist IV, drastically reducing the large number of categories to a—hopefully—more manageable and user-friendly structure in six parts. Adopting this proposal, the working group agreed to arrange all fragments to be dealt with in *FGrHist* IV under the following headings: IVA: *Biography*; IVB: *History of Literature, Music and Art* (including sections entitled Bühnenaltertümer, Bibliothekwesen, Pinakes, Kulturgeschichte, Heuremata by Jacoby); IVC: *Politeiai, Nomoi, and Nomima*; IVD: *History of Religion and Cult*; IVE: *Paradoxography, Poikilography and Antiquities* (including Ἀγῶνες, Κτίσεις, Αἰτίαι, Μετονομασίαι); IVF: Collections, Anthologies and Hypomnemata (including Apomnemoneumata, Apophthegmata, Chrestomathies; Paroemiography).

So far for the general structure of *FGrHist* IV. Another problem is the question as to which materials should be included under which heading. In dealing with this question—which inevitably has to be faced in any collection of fragments—we were mainly led, as is natural in a *continuation*-project, by the methodological guidelines originally laid down by Jacoby and governing his collection as a whole. This means primarily that we chose to adhere to the principle of editing together, as far as possible, all fragments of different works by a single author. However, it was not always clear under which heading an author should be classified, if he was active in a wide variety of fields. Having considered a number of options, it seemed best to proceed according

---

[6] Cf. O. Murray, *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture,* in *CQ* 22 (1972), p. 212-213.

[7] This seems to bear out the observation made by S.C. Humphreys, *Fragments, Fethishes, and Philosophies: Towards a History of Greek Historiography after Thucydides*, in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen 1996, p. 207-224, esp. p. 208, that Jacoby, having started his collection of fragments from a sharply formulated question about the origins of Greek historiography, "does not seem to have had any equally clear ideas about later developments."

[8] in: G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen 1996, p. 144-172.

to the following three hierarchical ground rules. Firstly, the total literary output of any writer should be edited in the section pointing to the author's main activity: following this principle, Dikaiarchos of Messene and Herakleides Pontikos will, for instance, be included in the volume on *History of Literature, Music, and Art* (IVB). Due references to the separate 'other' works by these authors are to be made at the appropriate places in the various corresponding sections. Secondly, when the main interest of an author cannot be determined, the sheer bulk of the fragments should be decisive. Hence the encyclopaedic oeuvre of Aristotle will appear in the volume on Πολιτεῖαι (IVC). Following our ground rules, the two extant fragments of Aristotle's περὶ ποιητῶν will only be indicated by means of a reference in the volume on *History of Literature*, while the texts themselves will appear in IVC, together with all of the other fragments. Thirdly, it may make sense to depart from the ground rule in a limited number of cases: thus the works of a single author may be split up and treated in different volumes, with different numbers, using cross-references. Jacoby himself occasionally resorted to this method[9]. A case in point within *FGrHist* IV is Aristoxenos of Tarentum: he was a key figure in both *Biography* and *Literary and Musical History*, and hence it is fully warranted, if not imperative, to split up his fragments into two separate categories, thus doing justice to the author's pioneering role in both genres.

As a result of the basic Jacoby-principle of keeping together the whole output of a given author, we do not intend to provide renewed treatment of authors or works which, on the basis of their very nature, would qualify for inclusion in one of the sections of *FGrHist* IV, but which have, for one reason or another, already been dealt with in previous parts of the collection. Reference (without a new number) will, of course, be made to Jacoby's earlier treatment. Here, too, exceptions may be made to the rule, where fresh evidence or important new evaluations seem to make it worthwhile reconsidering Jacoby's earlier discussion. As far as the section on biographical fragments is concerned, the rule of avoiding repetition applies evidently, and a fortiori, to all writings already published in *FGrHist* that deal, in one form or another, with (parts of) lives of individuals: such are the many *historical* monographs centring on an individual; *encomia* or *psogoi*. For all their closeness to biography, these works remain generically different. The question also arose as to what to do with *fictitious works*, i.e. the so-called 'Schwindelautoren'. Jacoby wanted to include

[9] Most notorious is the case of Hellanikos of Lesbos, basically dealt with in *FGrHist* 4, but reappearing in 323a; 601a; 608a; 645a; 687a.

them under a separate heading in *FGrHist* VI. Since it is now uncertain if there will ever be a part VI and what it might contain, these works have been incorporated whenever their fictitious character cannot be determined with certainty. Thus Timaios of Lokroi, Περὶ τοῦ Πυθαγόρου βίου has been included, but not without strong reservations regarding the author's historicity.

The editors of *FGrHist* IV realize that any distribution of the remains of antiquarian literature over the named categories must inevitably be artificial to some extent. To borrow a phrase from an orally delivered paper by Sally Humphreys: "antiquarians are a kind of people rather than a genre of books"[10]. The numerous overlaps between the different categories testify to the truth of this observation. In practice too, the dearth of our evidence, rendering virtually impossible any conclusion as to the scope or nature of a work surviving in only a few poorly attested fragments, may make the edition of such a work under a given category resemble a bet which it was ill-inspired to make in the first place. Yet, for all the justified criticism that the attempt at generic classification may incur, together the—by no means strictly separate or mutually exclusive—categories constitute a frame(work) for studying all remains of the Greek antiquarian tradition *in globo* as well as the possible interaction between the several subcategories. Antiquarian works were written or compiled in a great variety of forms and in amazing quantities in both the Greek and the Roman world. The lack, so far, of a comprehensive collection of all surviving evidence certainly accounts for the fact that hitherto only few attempts have been made to investigate how, in the ancient Greek, Hellenistic and Roman contexts, the studying of antiquities may have been related to the writing of history proper. It is only by gathering together the fragmentary pieces of evidence and by giving them the attention they deserve that we can try to begin to evaluate the contribution made by antiquarians to the ancients' use of the past in a wide variety of political, national, cultural, and religious settings. The question of how their works appealed to the tastes of highly cultured, erudite audiences and to the public at large has still to be brought into true perspective.

So much for the basic principles of arrangement per genre. As for the practical working methods adopted for the edition of the individual fragments, we likewise chose to comply, as much as possible, with the

---

10 "Antiquarians: A Problematic Category" (Leuven, March 18, 1997).

principles governing Jacoby's edition. This means, among other things, that only those passages where an ancient author is mentioned by name qualify for inclusion in this edition: a (more or less) accurate assessment and interpretation of the texts thus collected is already difficult and hazardous, as it is, without the addition of anonymous and, therefore, speculative material rendering the problems even bigger and increasing the editor's sense of insecurity. Furthermore, the available text material will be divided into two categories, the first comprising the *testimonia* pertaining to the life and work of an author, the second containing the 'fragments' of his various writings. By the very nature of the material which the student of a fragmentary writer has to work with—quotations by later authors, embedded in an account devised by the quoting author, which is often entirely different from the original context—, it is obvious that the problems which present themselves do not merely concern the reconstruction of the original context of the fragments and the analysis and interpretation of their contents. In the first place, a quotation has to be separated from the cover text[11] in which it has been inserted. Accordingly, it should be borne in mind that (after the example set by Jacoby himself) the ancient texts which are included in *FGrHist* IV have not been edited in the philological sense of the word, resting on a renewed examination of the original manuscripts or papyri: as a rule, the texts will be given such as they appear in what is accepted as the best critical edition available for each individual source (with a reduced critical apparatus and on the understanding, of course, that some additional emendation may always prove necessary). Instead, the editing activity mainly consists in the delimitation of what can, in each individual case, count as a fragment: where does the quotation begin? Where does it end? What is the degree of authenticity preserved in the "quotation"? Wholly in keeping with the manner in which Jacoby chose to present the testimonies and fragments in the first three parts of *FGrHist*, different typographical styles will be used in the text-edition for indicating the different degrees of certainty to which portions of the fragmentary text can be traced back to the lost work. In this respect, three levels will be distinguished: where a verbatim excerpt is given, the text will be printed in expanded modus (*Sperrdruck*); when the citing author merely gives a paraphrase or an indirect or abridged reference, the text will be presented in normal typeface, while parts of the fragmentary text that are doubtful are given in *petit*

---

11 On the notion 'cover text', see *Jacoby's* FGrHist: *Problems, Methods, Prospects* (cf. n. 8), p. 166-167.

druck. We have also opted, in the presentation of the texts, for maintaining the distinction between fragments surviving with or without a title and/or book number. For the user's convenience, however, these texts will not be separated (unlike in Jacoby). If it is possible on more or less plausible grounds (to be explained in the commentary) to attribute fragments to a given work or to a certain book, we have presented them at their putative place, but have indented the left margin in order to draw attention to the hypothetical nature of their attribution[12]. All in all, only the addition of an English translation of the testimonia and fragments (printed on the opposite page) will constitute a significant departure from Jacoby's practice[13]. Yet, this seemed to us a sensible thing to do, and not just as an essential, sometimes even critical, part of the editor's task of providing an interpretation of the text, but also in view of the fact that knowledge of Greek is no longer considered to be a prerequisite for beginning the study of the ancient world. In this way we hope to make the sources accessible to the non-specialist and to readers not versed in Greek who may be interested in the history of (ancient) historiography, and also to encourage the use of fragmentary texts at an early stage of academic instruction.

In order to mark the difference between the volumes published by F. Jacoby himself and the 'Fragmente der griechischen Historiker' *continued*, our numbering starts from 1000. References to *FGrHist continued* should be made as heretofore. Thus, the Suda-*testimonium* on Skylax' work on Herakleides of Mylasa, discussed under number 1000, should be referred to as *FGrHist* 1000 T 1.

*

To some, the publication of a fascicle covering the pre-hellenistic period may seem an unlikely beginning for the collection of fragments of Greek biographical writing. It has long been an accepted theory that Greek biography came into being at the beginning of the Hellenistic period, when some pupils of Aristotle started writing works with the purpose of verifying how ethical theories applied in the framework of a real, individual life. Another breeding ground appeared to

---

[12] This, in fact, is the method adopted by F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*.

[13] Actually, the idea that the addition of a translation could be a useful supplement to many a user does seem to have crossed Jacoby's mind as well: see [Vorwort] *FGrHist* IIIb, *Kommentar zu Nr. 297-607,* Leiden 1955.

be early Alexandria, where the need for a 'catalogue raisonné' for the newly-founded library, as well as the scientific pursuits of grammarians and philologists, stimulated studies in the field of literature on an unprecedented scale. The thesis that both centres gave a decisive impetus to the birth of biography as a literary genre was most impressively formulated by Leo in his epoch-making analysis of ancient biographical form: *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig 1901). Leo availed himself of the then popular tool of 'Formgeschichte' for identifying, within the ancient biographical tradition, two separate basic forms of writing the life of an individual—the 'Suetonian', scholarly-systematic and the 'Plutarchean', historical-chronological type. He traced these types back to their presumed peculiar origins in the 'Alexandrian' and 'peripatetic' schools respectively. Criticism of this view was prompted, among other things, by the discovery of a substantial fragment of the life of Euripides by Satyrus (*POxy* 1176), which unambiguously showed that Leo's formal approach had been forcing a straitjacket on the evidence. The failure of 'Formgeschichte', bringing increasing recognition that it may well be beyond our grasp to historically pinpoint the Hellenistic origins of Greek biography, naturally led scholars to apply a more open, less 'formal' approach and to study, on a more systematic and intense scale than Leo and other previous scholars had done, the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. as a potentially important formative period. Especially in the second half of this century, several important contributions point to a variety of biographically interesting focal points in early epic, lyric, historical, as well as philosophical and rhetorical literature[14]. This tendency in modern research received Momigliano's full scholarly support and was actually reinforced in his now standard survey of *The Development of Greek Biography*[15]. Rivalling D.S. Stuart's "half-hearted attempt to seek the origins of Greek biography in the fifth century B.C.", Momigliano, in the wake of H. Homeyer's important paper *Zu den Anfängen der griechischen Biographie* (1962), set himself the task of exploring the origins of biography in early classical literature more systematically than ever before. His discussion, tentative though it is, amounts to a zealous plea in favour of the view that "the first Greek biographies and autobiographies seem to belong to

---

[14] For an interesting survey of recent work, see I. Gallo, *Nascita e sviluppo della biografia greca: aspetti e problemi,* in I. Gallo – L. Nicastri (ed.), *Biografia e autobiografia degli antichi e dei moderni*, Napoli 1995, 7-22

[15] Momigliano's discussion of fifth and fourth century B.C biographies and autobiographies, in chapters II and III respectively, takes up even more pages (p. 23-64) than his treatment of the subsequent period *From Aristotle to the Romans* (p. 65-100).

the period between 500 and 480 B.C. and to be contemporary with the first works on genealogy and periegesis[16]."

It is undoubtedly due more to the current shift of interest in biographical scholarship than out of a strong personal conviction prompted by the probative force of the relevant fragmentary evidence, that we decided to open the present collection of biographical fragments with a first fascicle on the evidence dating from the fifth and fourth centuries. In this respect it should, first and foremost, be emphasized that (as anyone familiar with the literature on the subject knows) most of the claims about the early fifth and fourth-century beginnings of Greek biography are based, to an alarmingly large degree, on the presence of biographical narratives or elements of biographical interest incorporated in other genres as, for instance, epic poetry or the works of historians like Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon. Since the basic principle adopted in the present collection stipulates that the expression of biographical interest in various forms of non-biographical literature must be kept separate from the writing of biography proper, such passages—illuminating as they may be to all those engaged in tracing the history of how biography came into being as a genre of its own—do not qualify for inclusion here among the biographical fragments. To trace biography's varied pedigree in all sorts of literary genres goes far beyond the task of the collector of the biographical fragments: his more modest aim is to make available the extant fragmentary evidence of supposedly separate biographical works, which may be regarded as early, perhaps only 'embryonic' specimens of biographical writing.

The distinction between 'biographical' and 'non-biographical' works may be clear to modern theory. Its practical application to the ancient evidence, however, proved to be delicate, especially in the initial stages of the development of the genre. The very position of early biographical works midway between several literary genres precludes the adoption of neat criteria, both as to contents and form, by which one could readily recognize the works under discussion as specimens of biographical writing. Often, moreover, eligible work-titles or scraps of evidence proved too poorly attested (and without any context) to support any positive conclusions on their biographical nature or purpose. This state of affairs in the study of early Greek biography helps to explain why 'evidence' which appears to be highly significant in the eyes of one scholar, may, according to another,

[16] p. 101.

hardly bear any meaningful relationship to the subject[17]. It goes without saying that under these circumstances the selection of the authors and fragments to be included in the present volume proved to be particularly difficult. Given the minefield that is early Greek biography—virtually every piece of evidence is contested—it was impossible for us to aim at anything even remotely complete in the presentation of the relevant evidence, and hence, there are inevitably omissions and inclusions which will annoy or surprise some readers. In Jacoby's own words: "wie man's macht, macht man's falsch."[18]

As modern criticism remains strongly divided as to how to evaluate the contribution of fifth and fourth century B.C. Greek literature and culture in the formation of Greek biographical writing, differences of opinion were also naturally reflected within the team preparing the continuation of *FGrHist* IV. In the absence of any 'formal' criteria (such as, for instance, the word βίος as part of a title) or a concept of generic propriety which, at the earliest, arose at the beginning of the Hellenistic Period, we were mainly led by pragmatic considerations. The material presented in this fascicle are the fragmentary remains of works which scholars have been labelling—whether adamantly or hesitatingly, and not necessarily unanimously—as 'biographical' treatises or, at least, as compositions deserving our attention as early intimations of the later, formally constituted genre. Thus we hope, in view of the themes that became prominent in later biographical writing, to have offered at least a fair and representative sample of the remains of works on politicians, on the 'Seven Wise Men' and on philosophers. Following our basic principles it was decided that works with generic titles such as Περὶ ποιητῶν, Περὶ μουσικῶν and Περὶ τῶν (τριῶν) τραγῳδοποιῶν belong *in globo* to the part on Literary History, but require a cross-reference duly marked in IVA. All works dealing with Homer, including those entitled Περὶ Ὁμήρου, will also be edited together as part of *FGrHist* IVB. In the presentation of the fragments it seemed sensible to try to combine the basic chronological order, running from the early fifth (*FGrHist* 1000: Skylax of Karyanda) to the late fourth centuries B.C. (*FGrHist* 1013: Philiskos of Miletos), as far as possible with a topical arrangement,

[17] Skylax' work on Herakleides of Mylasa is a case in point: according to Momigliano (and others) it may well constitute the beginning of proper biographical writing; H. Homeyer (*Zu den Anfängen der griechischen Biographie*, in *Philologus* 106, 1962, p. 75-85), however, does not even take it into account as a relevant piece of evidence for the history of biography.

[18] *Vorrede*, in *FGrHist* IIA, Berlin 1926, III.

keeping together the authors that deal with the Seven Wise Men (*FGrHist* 1005-1007) and the 'biographers' of Plato (*FGrHist* 1008-1011).

Despite the many claims that authors of the 'classical' period already engaged in some kind of biographical writing, and that some of them might even be credited with having invented the genre, we have not come across a single unambiguous piece of evidence attesting the existence of biographical writing as such in the pre-Alexandrian era. As is apparent also from our commentaries, the searching analysis of even the most promising fragments has been, more often than not, a sobering experience. Though we have been looking for possible clues to bridge the gap between the 'antecedents' or early intimations of biography and its formal constitution[19], the evidence presented in this fascicle can hardly be considered to provide the missing link(s). But ultimately it must be left to the historian of ancient biography to judge how the potential fragmentary evidence for full biographical writing published here can possibly relate to the much larger body of biographical evidence incorporated in other genres.

The following are the fascicles scheduled to appear as part of *FGrHist* IVA*: Biography*:

* IVA 2 Hellenistic Period (IIIrd Century B.C.)
* IVA 3 Hellenistic Period (Hermippos the Callimachean, of Smyrna)
* IVA 4 Hellenistic Period (Late IIIrd - Early IInd Century B.C.)
* IVA 5 Hellenistic Period (IInd Century B.C.)
* IVA 6 Hellenistic Period (Late IInd - First Century B.C.)
* IVA 7 Period of the Roman Empire and undatable fragments
* IVA 8 Adespota

---

[19] As Homeyer (cf. note 17) appropriately remarked, when pointing out the generic 'gap' that separates these 'early expressions of biographical interest' and the writing of biography proper in the Hellenistic Period: "Die Lücke zwischen den Anfängen der biographischen Darstellung und dem biographischen Schrifttum des ausgehenden 4. Jahrhunderts wird sich kaum je befriedigend schließen lassen." (p. 85). Compare J. Geiger's perceptive comments: "While willingly acknowledging the contributions of Homeyer and Momigliano towards understanding the rise of the biographcial interest in general and the lives of statesmen and generals in particular, I must insist that these explorations did little towards answering the question when and how did it happen that entire works came to be devoted to 'the account of the life of a man ... from birth to death' instead of forming minor themes, digressions or incidental descriptions in recognized literary forms such as History." (*Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*, Stuttgart 1985, p. 15).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project could not have been undertaken without the participation or assistance of a number of individuals and institutions. Among the members of the *FGrHist* IV team I wish to express my thanks first and foremost to G.-A. Lehmann. He fathered the idea of continuing 'Jacoby', and I have shared with him since 1991 the struggle, the joys and the pains of putting the project in place.

The attempt to continue Felix Jacoby has, however, been, from the very start, a joint endeavour, for which all members of the *FGrHist* IV working-group deserve credit in their own way: all effectively helped to bring about the plan by taking an active part in the working sessions, either in Cologne or in Leuven, in which we discussed on a regular basis all scientific, methodological and practical problems involved in the undertaking. All members of the group deserve thanks for repeatedly testing (and questioning) the criteria for the selection and arrangement of the materials and for trying them out on several provisional lists of authors and titles; equally important were their critical comments on earlier drafts of the present fascicle. I may, however, single out two names for special mention. My debt to Jan Bollansée extends far beyond the contribution he has made as an author to the present fascicle: between 1991 and 1993 he undertook the greater part of the groundwork for the project as a whole by assiduously drawing up successive lists of authors and titles of works to be dealt with in *FGrHist* IV; assisted by Jan Raeymaekers, he acquitted himself with admirable skill of the far from easy task of transcribing Jacoby's handwriting. Part of J. Bollansée's doctoral dissertation will, furthermore, be published soon under the form of a separate fascicle (*FGrHist* IVA 3), which will be devoted entirely to the edition, with English translation and commentary, of the fragments of Hermippos of Smyrna. To Albert Henrichs I owe a late apology for having exploited his frequent flyer status: whenever he came to Europe we managed to schedule a meeting of our working group: A. Henrichs did not miss a single one of these sessions, and, with his learning, searching questions and encouragement, made an invaluable contribution to all of them. I have wonderful memories of his hospitality in Cambridge (Mass.), where, in November 1993, he introduced me to Prof. em. Herbert Bloch, from whom I received some excellent suggestions and much encouragement. It was H. Bloch,

who, one year earlier, had kindly supplied the continuation-team with a copy of the Jacoby-papers.

For the papyrological documentation required for *FGrHist* IV, the Jacoby-group is happy to enjoy continual good relations with the members of the Italian research group directed by Emilio Gabba, which is preparing the edition of the *Corpus dei Papiri Storici Greci e Latini*, and especially with its secretary Mario Capasso. It is with equal pleasure that I extend my sincere thanks to Prof. Italo Gallo, editor of the *Frammenti biografici da papiri,* for generously sharing his expertise and documentation. Our warm thanks go to his pupil, Dr. Rosa Giannattasio, for providing us with a copy of her dissertation *I frammenti delle "Successioni dei filosofi"* and, in particular, for spending part of her holidays in the summer of 1995 in Leuven, assisting us in preparing the edition and commentary of the fragmentary remains of the philosophical διαδοχαί (which will appear at the appropriate place in subsequent fascicles of *FGrHist* IVA). Again in regard to papyri, we are particularly indebted to P. Mertens and S. Boucquiaux of the University of Liège, for giving us access, more than once, to their rich documentation in the CEDOPAL.

Many thanks also go to all those scholars—M. Capasso, W. Clarysse, H. Heinen, G.W. Most, C. Steel, R. Vattuone, and F.W. Walbank—, whose expressions of support and endorsement of our applications to the Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen, the Onderzoeksraad K.U.Leuven and the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, greatly helped in getting this project under way. In this connection I would also like to recall two initiatives which, in the past few years, have inspired and encouraged my work on the historical fragments. The opportunity offered by Glenn W. Most to present a paper on *FGrHist* IV at his Heidelberg conference on the historical and methodological aspects of collecting fragments, challenged me to reflect more than I would have done spontaneously, upon the 'fundamentals' underlying the continuation project. One year earlier, the Convegno "La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino" (Cassino, September 1994), organised by O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia, had provided the incentive for a preliminary study of the fragments of a much, yet unjustly neglected branch of 'antiquarian' literature: the Greek paradoxographers.

I owe a special word of thanks also to Mrs. Els Theys, co-author of the first biography fascicle: although she joined the working group for only a brief period, her commitment and care were invaluable for most of the editorial work on the present volume. An important part of the final preparation of our texts for publication was, in the present case, the linguistic and stylistic revision of our 'English' drafts: I wish

to express my appreciation to Dr. John Dudley for judiciously pruning away from our manuscripts all errors and modes of expression that betray the non-native writer. In a similar vein, the *FGrHist* IV team would like to acknowledge the debt it owes to the Harvard University Press for the use that was made, sometimes in slightly modified form, of the English translations published in the *Loeb Classical Library*. We also wish to acknowledge with gratitude our borrowings from the *Penguin Classics*, as for instance, in the case of Plutarch's *Lives*. Finally, Julian Deahl, Senior Acquisitions Editor of *Brill Academic Publishers* as well as his colleagues Albert Hoffstaedt and Ms. Gera van Bedaf deserve to be mentioned for much more than their professional assistance during the process of publication. Their genuine interest in the project and substantial help in co-ordinating the various efforts to continue 'Jacoby' have proven an indispensable encouragement to us.

Last but not least, it would not have been possible for us to engage in the continuation project and to present our first results here without the financial support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the (Belgian) Nationaal Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, the Research Council of the K.U.Leuven, and the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung.

Guido Schepens (Leuven)

This page intentionally left blank

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 *Text editions and translations*

Cf. the bibliography of text editions and translations with each author.

The text editions which served as the basis for the edition of fragments in the present volume will be marked with a *.

2 *Dictionaries, encyclopedias, lexica and prosopographies*

C. Andresen – H. Erbse – O. Gigon – K. Schefold – K.F. Stroheker – E. Zinn (ed.), *Lexikon der alten Welt*, Zürich - Stuttgart 1965 (= *LAW*).

P.G.W. Clare (ed.), *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 8 fasc., Oxford 1968-1982.

R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684 – 321 B.C.*, Cambridge - New York - New Rochelle - Melbourne - Sydney 1989.

P.M. Fraser – E. Matthews (ed.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, I. *The Aegean Islands. Cyprus. Cyrenaica*, Oxford 1987 (= *LGPN* I).

J. Hofstetter, *Die Griechen in Persien. Prosopographie der Griechen im persischen Reich vor Alexander*, Berlin 1978.

S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth (ed.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford - New York 1996³ (= *OCD*).

J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, 2 vol., Berlin 1901-1903.

H.G. Liddell – R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented throughout by Sir* H.S. Jones *with the assistance of* R. McKenzie *and with the cooperation of many scholars. With a Revised Supplement* 1996, Oxford 1940⁹ (= 1996) (= *LSJ*).

M.J. Osborne – S.G. Byrne (ed.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, II. *Attica*, Oxford 1994 (= *LGPN* II).

A. Pauly – G. Wissowa – W. Kroll – K. Mittelhaus – K. Ziegler – H. Gärtner (ed.), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart - München 1893-1980 (= *RE*).

J.S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens* I, Princeton 1994.

K. Ziegler – W. Sontheimer – H. Gärtner (ed.), *Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike auf der Grundlage von Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 5 vol., Stuttgart - München 1964-1975 (= *DKP*).

3 *Secondary literature*

The following list of secondary literature contains publications on Greek literature and ancient biography frequently cited throughout the commentaries. For a more detailed bibliography, the reader is referred to the bibliography of secondary literature with each author.

The abbreviations used for periodicals are those listed in *L'année philologique. Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine* (fondée par J. Marouzeau), Paris 1928-.

G. Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi e biografici. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.

G. Camassa, *La biografia*, in G. Cambiano e.a. (ed.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* I 3, Roma 1994, p. 303-332.

A. Dihle, *Die Entstehung der historischen Biographie*, Heidelberg 1987.

A. Dihle, *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*, Göttingen 1970[2].

J.A. Fairweather, *Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers*, in *AncSoc* 5 (1974), p. 231-275.

J. Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Ia. *Von den Anfängen bis auf die Sophistenzeit*. Ib. *Anmerkungen*, Heidelberg 1926.

B. Gentili – G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought*, Amsterdam 1988.

F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*, Leizig 1901 (= Hildesheim 1965).

A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern - München 1971[3].

K. Meister, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*, Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln 1990.

A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography. Expanded Edition*, Cambridge (Mass.) - London 1993[2].

W. Nestle – W. Liebich, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Berlin 1961[3].

C.B.R. Pelling, *Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography*, in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Oxford 1990, p. 213-244.

W. Schmid – O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I. Teil. *Die klassische Periode der griechischen Literatur*, 1. Band. *Die griechische Literatur vor der attischen Hegemonie*, München 1929.

D.R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, Berkeley 1928.

F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 vol., Leipzig 1891-1892 (= Hildesheim 1965).

K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, I. *Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides*, Berlin 1967.

F. Wehrli, *Gnome, Anekdote und Biographie*, in *MH* 30 (1973), p. 193-208.

TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES
NOS. 1000-1013

1000 (= 709). Skylax of Karyanda

(second half 6th cent. B.C.–after 480 B.C.)

T

1 (*FGrHist* 709 T 1 = *GGM* I p. XXXIV) *Suda* Σ 710 *s.v.* Σκύλαξ Καρυανδεύς (πόλις δ' ἐστὶ τῆς Καρίας πλησίον Ἁλικαρνασσοῦ τὰ Καρύανδα)· μαθηματικὸς καὶ μουσικός. Περίπλουν τῶν ἐκτὸς τῶν Ἡρακλέους στηλῶν· Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα· Γῆς Περίοδον· Ἀντιγραφὴν πρὸς τὴν Πολυβίου ἱστορίαν.

---

2 δ' om. A **3** τῶν <ἐντος καὶ> ἐκτος τῶν τοῦ Ἡρ. στηλ. G.J. Vossius; τῶν ἐντὸς τῶν Mue, Bernhardy **3** τῶν ἐκτὸς τοῦ G **4** μυλασῶν V^{ac}GM Μυλασέων? **5** Τὰ κατὰ ... ἱστορίαν om. F

1000 (= 709). Skylax of Karyanda

(second half 6th cent. B.C.–after 480 B.C.)

T

1 Skylax of Karyanda (Karyanda is a city in Karia near Halikarnassos). He was a mathematician and musician. [He wrote] an *Account of the Coasting Voyage outside the Pillars of Herakles; Stories about Herakleides, Tyrant (or King) of Mylasa; Circuit of the Earth; Reply to the History of Polybios.*

1000 (= 709). Skylax of Karyanda

(second half 6th cent. B.C.–after 480 B.C.)

T

(1) The text of all of the testimonies and fragments concerning Skylax of Karyanda (hereafter S.) have already been edited in the present collection under no. 709. S. is treated there together with other writers of *Indika*. For a full discussion of S. and of the works to be attributed to him the reader is referred to the commentary *ad locum*[1]. Jacoby, following his editorial policy of dealing with the entire output of a given author in one place, definitely did not intend to reserve extra space for S. in the volume on biographical fragments: S. does not figure on his hand-written list of authors to be included in part *FGrHist* IV. Jacoby, as we shall see, had scholarly motives of his own for not considering S. as a possible 'biographical' author.

There are, however, two reasons for reconsidering here the most important questions raised by the title Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, mentioned in the *Suda*-entry. One reason is that—contrary to Jacoby's warning—, we are inclined to accept the present-day *communis opinio* according to which the work on Herakleides is an authentic piece of writing to be attributed to the late 6th-century explorer of India, S. of Karyanda. While we can only speculate as to whether Jacoby, subjecting his views to a final revision *now*, would have altered his opinion, nothing in his preparatory notes, as far as these are available to us[2], encourages the belief that he would have ceased entertaining serious doubts as to both the authorship and authenticity of S.'s work on Herakleides. His very last published word on the problem appeared in 1957, in the *Nachträge zum Kommentar* to *FGrHist* 10, and takes issue with the evolving scholarly consensus in the following terms: "Aber die frage nach zeit (und echtheit) der in der Sudavita verzeichneten schrift Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα des 'Periplographen' Skylax ... ist noch komplizierter als man

---

[1] The commentary on *FGrHist* 709 will be edited on the basis of Jacoby's papers by C.W. Fornara.

[2] These are the provisional lists and preparatory notes concerning all authors to be dealt with in *FGrHist* IV-VI, kindly made available to us by Prof. H. Bloch (Harvard University). The handwritten notes include, among other things, a number of interesting observations on the old logographer's homonym, Skylax of Halikarnassos ('Zettel' 944), which show, at least in outline, how Jacoby intended to deal with all related problems involved in *FGrHist* 709 T 1. Jacoby's own draft commentary on *FGrHist* 709 was not available to us.

gemeinhin annimmt."[3]. It is more than interesting to look at the reasons for this great scholar's (mis)apprehension. The main obstacle, as we shall see below, turns out to be Jacoby's broader, evolutionary, view of the development of Greek historiography, which allows no conceptual space for such a specialised form of historical writing as far back as the start of the fifth century B.C.

A second reason for undertaking a fresh discussion of the problems connected with the title in question is that many critics have gone to the other end of the scholarly spectrum, especially in the last decades, and have been labelling S.'s work on Herakleides with amazing confidence as a *bios* or biography. Admittedly, most of these utterances have been made loosely and lack any attempt at justification. Some able scholars, though, have been arguing at some length their case for considering S.'s book as some sort of biographical work or even for greeting the author as the first biographer in Greek literature[4] . In contrast, others—including, quite significantly, some notable critics who have been projecting the origins of Greek biography in various forms of literature in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.—have flatly denied the biographical character of the work on Herakleides[5] or have simply ignored it[6].

Together these controversial views constitute sufficient grounds for re-addressing, in the framework of the present collection, the questions raised by the title Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα. What do we really know or can we reasonably surmise about the character of this work? The circumstance that merely the six words of its title survive, and, then only in a demonstrably erratic *Suda*-article, compiled some 1500 years after the work was probably written, is bound to offer a wide range of possible views and interpretations. The paucity, moreover, of the surrounding evidence (itself in part fragmentary) which can be securely brought to bear on the author, the subject of the work and the circumstances of its composition, would seem to make the fragment under discussion particularly apt to fit any theory. In our examination we shall start with a survey of the problems raised by the text transmitted in the *Suda*, and then scrutinize the evidence concerning both Skylax and Herakleides with a view to discovering possible clues as to the nature of the work.

---

3 *FGrHist* I (second edition), Leiden, 1957, p. 543.

4 The Italian scholars MAZZARINO (1966: 83-87), MOMIGLIANO (1971: 29-30; 36-38; 44) and, in their wake, also PERETTI (1979: 2 with n. 3; 64-66).

5 HOMEYER (1962: 82 n. 1): "Die Titelfassung läßst eine Geschichtserzählung vermuten, zumal noch Sosylos Herakleides erwähnt."

6 LEO (1901: 85-117) makes no mention of S. in his otherwise well-documented overview in ch. 5. Nor is S. discussed by STUART (1928).

For several centuries agreement has existed among classical scholars that the notice on S. in the *Suda* represents a garbled version involving more than one homonym[7]. The lemma is composed as follows. After the identification of the author as a citizen of Karyanda (Καρυανδεύς) and an ensuing geographical note, explaining that Karyanda is a city in Karia near Halikarnassos (πόλις δ' ἐστὶ τῆς Καρίας πλησίον Ἁλικαρνασσοῦ τὰ Καρύανδα), S. is characterised as a μαθηματικὸς καὶ μουσικός. 'His' list of works comprises four items in the following order: (1) Περίπλους τῶν ἐκτὸς τῶν Ἡρακλέους στηλῶν, (2) Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, (3) Γῆς Περίοδος, (4) Ἀντιγραφὴ πρὸς τὴν Πολυβίου ἱστορίαν.

Depending on how one wishes to allocate these titles, there are at least two and perhaps three different 'Skylaxes' lurking in this entry. Only two things are evident from the start: (a) S. of Karyanda, the old 'logographer' (see 709 T 2) and explorer of the Indian coasts by order of Dareios I (T 3a = Herodot. 4, 44), can safely be credited with the work first mentioned in the catalogue, the *Periplus*; and (b): this same author cannot possibly have written the *Reply to the History of Polybios*. The latter work is widely believed to be that of Skylax of Halikarnassos, the mathematician and astronomer mentioned by Cicero as a contemporary of Panaitios[8]. The qualification μαθηματικὸς καὶ μουσικός given by the *Suda* seems to suit his particular profile[9]. The possibility of a third Skylax must be entertained for the third work in the catalogue, the Γῆς Περίοδος, if only on the assumption that this title is to be regarded as a duplicate of the fourth century B.C. *Periplus*[10], circulating mistakenly under S.'s name and now well-known as the *Pseudo-Scylax*. If, however, as some critics have suggested, Γῆς Περίοδος is to be understood as a "Map of the World", it could point to the map which the old S. may have added as a graphic supplement to his literary work[11]. There would then be no need to involve Ps.-Skylax as a possible third author.

---

[7] See already VOSSIUS (1623: 19); MÜLLER (1849: 183); VON GUTSCHMID (1854).

[8] See CIC., *Div.* 2, 88: *Scylax Halicarnasseus, familiaris Panaetii, excellens in astrologia idemque in regenda sua civitate princeps, totum hoc Chaldaeicum praedicendi genus repudiavit.* ["Skylax of Halikarnassos, an intimate friend of Panaitios and an eminent astronomer, besides being the head of the government in his own city, utterly repudiated the Chaldaean method of foretelling the future."] Cf. GISINGER (1927: 624), with reference to previous literature, *inter alia*, MÜLLER *GGM* I prol. XXXVIII.

[9] Cf. NIEBUHR (1815: 125); VON GUTSCHMID IV (1853); JACOBY (Zettel 944); PERETTI (1979: 63-64).

[10] This view was held by VON GUTSCHMID (1854, 141-146).

[11] In this, he would have followed Anaximander's and Hekataios' manner: see GISINGER (1927: 624-625) and PERETTI (1979: 2 and 69-70; & 1983: 91-92); SCHMID – STÄHLIN (1929: 701 n. 6) consider this an unlikely possiblity.

Whatever the correct number of authors, in the course of the history of modern scholarship the work Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα has been variously allocated to all possible 'Skylaxes' mentioned so far. The old ἀνὴρ Καρυανδεύς (cf. also T 3a; 4; 5) is by far top of the bill, especially since the discovery of the Sosylos-papyrus (see below); but the fourth century B.C. namesake was suggested by Niebuhr[12], whereas Müller pleaded the case of S. of Halikarnassos[13].

In view of the intermingling of 'historical' and 'geographical' writings in the *Suda* catalogue of titles, Müller sought to explain the confusion as the result of the lexicographer conflating several sources while composing this entry[14]. As often happens in such cases, titles naming the same work differently in different sources may have been erroneously taken as indicating separate works. Thus, in Müller's view the 'Periplus' and the 'Periodos' are simply different labels for the *Account of the Coasting Voyage outside the Pillars of Herakles*, written by the old logographer. In a similar vein, proposing a possible solution for Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, Müller suggested that the phrase may be seen as a description of the contents of the Ἀντιγραφὴ πρὸς Πολύβιον[15], the work written by S. of Halikarnassos. How exactly the confusion could have come about is, of course, a matter of speculation. But the notion that the *Suda* may have fused two lemmata into one, is at least as likely as that he was erroneously processing information from different sources. Peretti believes that the error of combining two consecutive lemmata devoted to homonyms—S. of Karyanda and S. of Halikarnassos—was all the more easily induced by the common geographical background of both writers: the *Suda*-article still points out the proximity of their respective cities. One could perhaps take a further step and raise the question whether the fusion of the lemmata was not intentional. In this case we would have to understand the lexicographer's inserted note on the vicinity of

---

12 Niebuhr (1815: 126). On this view Jacoby committed the following observations to paper: "dass im 4. jhdt. jemand über karischen dynasten schrieb, ist wenigstens nicht unmöglich. Aber Sosylos 176 F1 macht den Skylax Herodots so gut wie sicher" (Zettel 944).

13 Müller, *FHG* III 183; *GGM* I, *Proleg.*, p. XXXVIII.

14 Müller, *FHG* III 183: "*e compluribus auctoribus corrasos*"; cf. also Müller (1855: XXXVIII).

15 While acknowledging that Herakleides is absent from the extant pages of Polybius' *Histories,* Müller (1855: XXXVIII) surmised that a Carian 'petty king' (*regulus*) of that name may have been mentioned in a lost portion describing events involving Mylasians in Lykia and Karia, freed by the Romans after the war against Antiochos III (cf. Polyb. 30, 5. 11-16). Müller's view found no acceptance with modern scholarship and was rightly rejected by Jacoby (Zettel 944).

Halikarnassos and Karyanda as some sort of justification on his part for combining two articles into one[16].

Given the highly problematic 'context' in the *Suda*, there is but one work, in Jacoby's view, which can securely be attributed to S. of Karyanda. As the typographical presentation of the text of *FGrHist* 709 T 1 makes plain, this is the Περίπλους τῶν ἐκτὸς τῶν Ἡρακλέους στηλῶν, which has been printed in expanded size[17]. Its authenticity can be adequately vouched for on the basis of seven fragments[18]. Herodotos (4, 44 = *FGrHist* 709 T 3a), furthermore, describes S. of Karyanda's exploratory mission[19], and probably knew and used the *Periplus*, directly or indirectly.

However, several other passages from Herodotos (5, 121-122 combined with 5, 37) have been invoked, even as early as 1854, with a view to 'rightfully' restoring to S. of Karyanda the authorship of the work on Herakleides which Müller had denied him: according to von Gutschmid's plausible argument, the old S., being a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Herakleides, was the obvious man to write about this Carian national hero and king of Mylasa who, in the course of the Ionian-Carian revolt, succeeded in ambushing and routing a Persian army division together with its leaders[20].

At the beginning of the twentieth century the discovery of the Sosylos-papyrus (Würzburger library) adduced new evidence, apparently corroborating the inferences drawn from Herodotos and further narrowing the scope for speculation about the enigmatic title Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα. The fragment in question, taken from Sosylos' *History of Hannibal* (*FGrHist* 176 F 1), contains part of the narrative of a naval battle, most probably that between the Romans and the Carthaginians off the mouth of the Ebro in 217 B.C.[21]. As

---

16 In this respect the *Suda*'s method, although not very commendable in itself, would constitute a parallel to the practices of some modern scholars who see no harm, for instance, in identifying Euanthes of Samos and Euanthes of Miletos in view of their proximate provenance (cf. *FGrHist* IVA2, 1018 & 1019).

17 It is perhaps a mere coincidence that one manuscript of the *Suda*—Laurentianus 55,1—only mentions the *Periplus* and has dropped all other works from the catalogue of writings. See critical apparatus.

18 *FGrHist* 709 F 1-7. Aristotle seems to be quoting from S.'s work in F 5. For a brief, but useful general discussion of later authors mentioning the work of S. *On India*, see ALLAIN (1977: 60-63).

19 To be dated between 519 and 512 B.C: see OLSHAUSEN (1991: 78).

20 VON GUTSCHMID (1854: 141-146). On the Herodotos-passages, see also the further comments by LEGRAND (1946: 58-59 with n. 2) and VIRGILIO (1975: 131-132).

21 This identification was tentatively proposed by WILCKEN (1906 : 127-136) and is—although not fully ascertained (compare POLYB. 3, 95-96 and LIV. 22, 19-20) and in spite of Jacoby's reservations voiced in the commentary on *FGrHist* 176 F 1 (IID, p. 603-604)—accepted by most scholars today: see SEIBERT (1993a: 261-262) with bibliography; and ZECCHINI (1997: 1061-1062); FERONE (1992) proposed some new readings of the papyrus text, endorsing the case for the Ebro-battle.

allies to the Romans, the Massaliotes, so we are told, remember before entering battle the stratagem which Herakleides of Mylasa had successfully applied against the Phoenician ships ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι. By imitating Herakleides' *diekplus*-tactic the Massaliotes succeed in outmanoeuvring the Carthaginians and secure victory for the Romans. Wilcken, the first editor of the papyrus, assumed that the battle ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι was identical with the battle of the first day fought off Euboea between the Greeks and Persians in 480 B.C.[22]. Hence he identified the Herakleides referred to with the personage already known from the *Suda* and Herodotos[23]. In spite of a number of remaining questions which will be addressed below—they concern Herodotos' silence on Herakleides' naval feat as well the difficulty of fitting in the Mylasian's action into his account of the battle off Artemision—the Würzburger papyrus led scholars to agree that there was such a work as *The Stories about Herakleides* and that its author was the old S.[24]. Additional support was given to Wilcken's view in an important paper by Bengtson[25], in which, among other things, fresh evidence on a possible Athenian context for the composition of S.'s work on Herakleides is discussed (see below). It was this very article which provoked Jacoby's warning (cited above) against the 'oversimplified' beliefs commonly held concerning the authenticity and the authorship of S.'s work on Herakleides.

In contrast to the broad scholarly consensus on these matters, Jacoby stands apart as a dissenting voice. His doubts, which were but cautiously expressed in the commentary on *FGrHist* 176 F 1[26], seem to have persisted and increased over the years. His reluctance, one suspects, is more a matter of firmly held general views about the origin of Greek historiographical writing than of unprejudiced evaluation of the relevant evidence. The heart of the matter is revealed in his hand-written notes on Skylax of Halikarnassos. There we read

[22] Described in HERODOT. 8, 9-11.

[23] WILCKEN (1906: esp. p. 119-127). On the title βασιλεύς, see Wilcken (1906: 120). As HORNBLOWER (1982: 59) suggests, Herakleides may have been king not merely of the Mylasians but of the Carian κοινόν which met at Mylasa.

[24] Still, there is difference of opinion about the question whether Sosylos was actually referring to S.' work or was only indirectly aware of it. The rather vague φασίν which introduces the reference to Herakleides (III 6), may point to his use of some collection of *strategemata*: compare Jacoby's firm statement to this effect in his commentary on FGrHist 176 F 1 (IID, p. 605): "S hat jedenfalls nicht das alte buch, sondern eher eine zusammenstellung von στρατηγήματα (with earlier bibliography) benutzt." *Vide infra*, p. 16.

[25] See BENGTSON (1954/5).

[26] Thus, in his commentary on FGrHist 176 F 1 (IID, p. 605) he writes: "über Herakleides hat Skylax geschrieben, *dessen identität mit dem kapitän des Dareios nicht ganz sicher ist*" (my italics, G.S.).

that a title such as Τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην τῶν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα is highly problematic at the beginning of the fifth century B.C.[27]. As a possible alternative solution he suggests seriously considering the possibility that the author of the *Reply to the History of Polybius*—Scylax of Halikarnassos—may have written a further historical work, namely the work on Herakleides. Curiously enough, this idea must have left Jacoby considerably perplexed, since in the same breath he admits that both the place of the work on Herakleides in *Suda*'s list and Sosylos F 1 militate against such a supposition. The title Τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην τῶν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα confronted the author of *FGrHist* with a serious dilemma: either accept the most obvious conclusions to be drawn from the evidence and admit the existence of "das alte Buch", written by S. of Karyanda[28], or cast suspicion on the transmitted title which, if declared authentic, would prove a serious obstacle to his evolutionary view of Greek historiography. This view, as is well known, places the writing of κοίναι πράξεις at the beginning of Greek historiography and explains the emergence of all sorts of specialized historical monographs as the result of subsequent development, inaugurated by the writing of general history itself. Finally, Jacoby seems to have decided the Skylax/Herakleides-issue on the basis of his general theory. His tentative way out of the disturbing difficulties is outlined in the following reasoning: "Sein [*scil.* Herakleides'] andenken hat die in Καρικά übergegangene volksüberlieferung erhalten. Wer daraus ein sonderbuch machte und warum bleibt unsicher. Aber wenigstens die zeit des Panaitianers passt nicht slecht, auch wenn man als verfasser lieber an einen Mylasenser denken möchte (über die befreiungskämpfe dieser stadt mit Rhodos, s. Polyb. [XXX 5-6]; Liv. [XLV 25]" (Zettel 944). To postulate, however, yet another author (another Skylax ?) compiling at some unknown time a separate

[27] The statement is part of Jacoby's criticism of Müller's proposal to identify the work on Herakleides with the *Reply to the History of Polybios*. Notwithstanding this, Jacoby is willing (a) to take Müller's main point that S. of Halikarnassos could be the author of the work on Herakleides too, and (b) to share his predecessor's conviction that it would be an utterly strange thing for a logographer like S. of Karyanda to have written the kind of "particularem historiam" about a coeval, which τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην τῶν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα apparently is. "Dagegen muss man ernsthaft erwägen (obwohl die stellung in der liste und Sosylos F eher dagegen sprechen), ob ihm dann nicht eine weitere historische schrift gehört—τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην τῶν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα—, die im anfang des 5. jhdts. v. Chr. starke schwierigkeiten macht."

[28] In the commentary on the Sosylos-papyrus (176 F 1) Jacoby seems to be rather open to this option. In a similar vein, he added, on Zettel 944, a supplementary note to the title Τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην τῶν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, as follows: "Aber Sosylos 176 F 1 macht den Skylax Herodots so gut wie sicher."

monograph out of a local history of Karia (Καρικά), which had preserved the popular oral memories of Herakleides' feats, seems to us to be an unwarranted and needlessly complicated case of special pleading. A more open, less dogmatic view of the origin of Greek historiography—which is in itself commendable for several reasons[29]—is all that is needed to make room for the more economic and reasonable solution which the available evidence spontaneously suggests: the old S. of Karyanda, and none other, ought to be credited with the work on his contemporary and fellow country-man Herakleides of Mylasa[30]. The wider historiographical consequences of this view will have to be assessed elsewhere[31].

Whereas the Sosylos papyrus greatly helped to clarify the discussion about the authorship and the authenticity of the *Stories about Herakleides* (without, however, entirely laying it to rest), the reference, in column III 1-11, to Herakleides' achievement ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι fuelled speculation in another direction: was it really, as Wilcken believed, to be understood as a reference to the well-known naval engagement of 480 B.C. in the Euboean waters? How, on that view, are we to explain Herodotos' silence about Herakleides' role in the battle? And how, in addition, should one account for the rather startling fact, recorded by Sosylos, that the Massaliotes towards the end of the third century B.C. still kept detailed memories of Herakleides' achievement? The way in which these closely related questions are answered, will, naturally, have repercussions on how we envisage the possible contents and perhaps also the character of S.'s work on Herakleides.

The Artemision-discussion goes back to the time of the publication of the Sosylos-papyrus. Objecting to Wilcken's view, Rühl maintained that Herakleides' action as described by Sosylos was absolutely incompatible with Herodotos' account in 8, 9-11[32]. He therefore proposed identifying Sosylos' battle ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι with some (unknown) sea-battle fought in the course of the Ionian Revolt near Carian Artemision[33]. The possible objection that no such sea-battle has been

---

[29] For the latest criticism of Jacoby's evolutionary view of the origin of Greek historiography, see FOWLER (1996).

[30] This is *communis opinio* today: cf. the succinct treatment of S. (n. 288) in HOFSTETTER (1978: 164-165).

[31] I intend to do this in a paper on *Herodotus and the Historical Tradition*, in E. BAKKER – I. DE JONG – H. VAN WEES (ed.), *Herodotus: A Handbook* (Handbooks. Supplements to Mnemosyne), Brill, Leiden (forthcoming).

[32] RÜHL (1906); cf. also BILABEL (1922: 32).

[33] On this location, see STRABO 14, 2.2 (c. 651).

recorded was judged immaterial by Rühl[34], who, on the contrary, emphasised that his solution had a double advantage over Wilcken's previous attempt: not only could the absence of a reference to Herakleides' action by Herodotos be more easily explained; but a naval encounter off the Carian coast would also fit in with the geographical theatre in which the Mylasian hero was known from other passages in Herodotos to have operated successfully. Rühl's hypothesis found favour with a number of scholars, among them Bilabel and Jacoby[35]. However, since evidence of a naval battle near Carian Artemision is lacking, I tend to agree with Wilcken's brief reply that Rühl's proposed 'solution' serves only to put off the whole problem[36].

Another explanation along the same lines was also attempted. Setting out from the assumption that one needed at least to reconstruct a plausible *historical* background for the uncommon fact that at the end of the third century B.C. Herakleides' naval exploit was still *famous among the Massaliotes*, other scholars were led to search for some Artemision in the Western Mediterranean area. A possible location was spotted by Munro in 1926: he proposed the site Hemeroskopeion, a Massaliote foundation on the Iberian coast, with, on its promontory, a temple to the Ephesian Artemis[37]. Describing the place, which was once used by Sertorius as a naval base, Strabo writes that it was also called "Dianium", the equivalent [in Greek] of Artemision: καλεῖται δὲ Διάνιον, οἷον Ἀρτεμίσιον.[38] On Munro's Iberian hypothesis Herakleides is claimed to have fled to the West after the failure of the Ionian Revolt (Lade 496 B.C.). There, at about 490 B.C.[39], he might have become involved as a commander in an otherwise unrecorded

---

[34] (Rühl 1906: 357) "Dass uns von einer Seeschlacht bei einem Artemision in Kleinasien nichts überliefert ist, ist ohne Gewicht, denn nach dem Gefecht von Pedason erfahren wir ja bei Herodot, unserer bis dahin einzigen Quelle, überhaupt nichts mehr von Herakleides."

[35] Bilabel (1922: 32); Jacoby in his commentary to *FGrHist* 176 F 1 (IID, p. 605); Legrand (1946: 58-59 n. 2); compare also Schmid – Stählin (1929: 701-702 n. 9): "Bei Artemision 480 kann Herakleides nicht mitgekämpft haben."

[36] Wilcken (1907: 512). The very criticism Rühl (1906) had been voicing against Wilcken (1906) was, *mutatis mutandis,* used against him by Hignett (1963: 395), who maintained that "a victory of the type presupposed by Sosylos cannot be fitted into Herodotus' narrative of the Ionian Revolt."

[37] Munro (1926: 289).

[38] Strabo 3, 4.4 (c. 159).

[39] Cf. Munro (1926: 289), and, independently, also Mazzarino (1947: 13); Peretti (1979: 65-66). Manganaro (1959: esp. 290) thinks that a date at about 500 B.C. is possible, but see Virgilio (1975: 131).

sea-battle between 'Phoenicians' (*i.e.* Carthaginians) and Massaliotes ἐπ' 'Αρτεμισίωι (now Cap Nao on the Spanish coast). The thesis of a naval battle at Cap Nao has proved attractive to several scholars[40] and has, in some quarters, even attained the status of a 'factoid'[41] of ancient history.

Despite the apparent double advantage of explaining Herodotus' silence more adequately[42] and of providing the Massaliotes with a specific ground for recalling Herakleides' stratagem[43], serious doubts may be entertained as to the historical, topographical and historiographical presumptions underlying the Iberian hypothesis. Not only does it give rise to the same objection formulated against the 'Carian' solution, namely that no historical record survives of this alleged 'famous' battle. Admittedly, our historical tradition is far too defective to turn this *argumentum e silentio* into a fatal objection against postulating at least the possibility of such a naval encounter. Clashes between Carthaginian and Massaliot fleets are likely to have occurred in this area more than once[44]. More damaging, however, to the propounded thesis is the fact that we cannot be sure that the spot where the battle allegedly took place, was ever called 'Artemision'[45]. Strabo's phrase οἷον 'Αρτεμίσιον can hardly be attributed the value of a toponym: it is clearly a gloss added by the geographer in order to explain to his Greek audience the meaning of the Latin *Dianium*. Above all, however, the rationale underlying this whole reconstruction must be called into question. To claim that a proper *historical setting* is required for the

---

40 See Bosch-Gimpera (1950) and, in addition to the bibliography in Manganaro (1959), Peretti (1979: 2 with n. 2 and 65-66); Huss (1985: 67) and Rouillard (1991: 236) (both with caution). Compare also Ferone (1992: 128 n. 4).

41 The victory of the Massaliotes over the Carthaginian fleet on the Spanish coast near Cape Artemision (490 B.C.) under the command of 'king' Herakleides of Mylasa is simply related as a straightforward fact by Pallottino (1987: 96). The latter even goes on to speculate on its occurence at the same time as Marathon, which, in his view, may be interpreted as a symptom of a joint (also coordinated ?) attack of Persia and Carthage against the Greek world. For other examples in the field of ancient history of "the process by which mere hypotheses attain the apparent rank of established fact", see F.G. Maier (1985).

42 As a matter of course, an event in the far West did not fall within the scope of his *Histories*.

43 Both advantages are stressed by Peretti (1979: 65-66).

44 The—partly controversial—evidence can be found in Huss (1985: 67), with bibliography. More recently, see also Rouillard (1991: 236-237) and Ameling (1993: 127-128); the latter, however, remarks rightly: "Der Sosylos-Papyrus gehört nicht an diese Stelle" (p. 128 n. 52).

45 Cf. Hignett (1963: 395-396) and *pace* Manganaro (1959: 286-288).

Massaliotes to have remembered Herakleides' action[46], is, we believe, entirely erroneous.

Upon closer inspection the reference to Herakleides' achievement in Sosylos' account does not so much require a historical as a *historiographical* explanation. Except for Wilcken and Ferone, all interpreters of the Sosylos' fragment have been overlooking the basic fact that the tale of Herakleides' prowess is not part of Sosylos' actual description of the sea-battle, but of an account in which he is looking back on it. As Wilcken perspicaciously deduced from Sosylos' use of the aorist in πᾶσαι μὲν διαφόρως ἠγωνίσαντο (II 2-3), the battle at that stage of his narrative is already over. The aorist κατέστησαν in line 8 of the same column corroborates this observation. The portion of text preserved on the papyrus, then, must be seen—and interpreted accordingly—as an ἐπιμετρῶν λόγος[47], added to the narrative proper. In evaluative comments of this kind Greek historians used to express their personal views concerning events they described and provide an appraisal of them. After-battle comments, such as we have here, normally judge the achievements of both sides. This is exactly what we find in the

---

[46] This point is the main thrust of Manganaro (1959) criticizing Bengtson (1954/55) "sul piano della interpretazione storica" (p. 286). The Italian scholar argues that the phrase οἱ Μασσαλιῶται μνήμηι προγενεστέρων καὶ κατωρθωμένων πράξεων ἐπακολουθοῦντες should be interpreted in the strict sense of the Massaliotes remembering and imitating the successes *of their own forefathers* ("dei loro padri i Massalioti!") (see, esp. p. 284-285). The corollary is that Herakleides' stratagem must belong to "una battaglia combattuta dagli antenati dei Massalioti nel mare iberico". This interpretation, however, is far from compelling for the following combined reasons: (a) the strict interpretation proposed would seem to run counter to the *wider* acceptance of προγενέστεροι in the sense of "predecessors", "previous generations"; (b) μνήμηι as well as προγενεστέρων καὶ κατωρθωμένων πράξεων lack the article, indicating that the reference to "achievements of previous generations" is made in very general terms; such general interpretation of the phrase in the sense of "successes of the *Greeks* in the past" makes perfect sense in view of the ensuing contrast to the *Carthaginian* rivals of the Massaliotes (καὶ τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἐπιπλεόντων); (c) one may also wonder how the crucial role of Herakleides—surely not one of the "antenati dei Massalioti"', but explicitly identified as τὸμ Μυλασσέα μὲν τῶι γένει (III 6-8)—could be fitted into a reference to a strictly 'Massaliot' past. Manganaro suggests that he was appointed as "commander of the Massaliotes" (p. 290). A more general reference to the past seems to offer a more economic and appropriate explanation: because of his achievement ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι Herakleides had undoubtedly earned his place within the 'Greek' tradition (in the same way as S. of Karyanda, writing in Greek, was considered to be a Greek author). Significantly, Sosylos does not mention Herakleides' Carian origin in the present context.

[47] Compare Polyb. 7, 7.7. Other instances are discussed by Pédech (1964: 408-410). According to Polybios Ephoros was pre-eminent in making of ἐπιμετροῦντες λόγοι (see *FGrHist* 70 T 23 = Polyb. 12, 28.10). Ferone (1992: 135 n. 22; 139) considers the διέκπλους-narrative to be a "digressione di carattere tecnico-militare".

papyrus. In regard to the Carthaginians it is said that they did not fight the sea-battle in a manner worthy of their fatherland and fell short of the most brilliant achievements of their forefathers: ναυμα[χ ... οὐ]δὲν ἄξι[ον .... τῆ]ς πατρίδος [...... τῶν] προγόνων [ἐνδοξότατα] πραττομέ[νων (I 9-14). On the Roman side the Massaliotes' ships are singled out as having been instrumental in achieving the victory: ἤρξαντό τε γὰρ πρῶται καὶ τῆς ὅλης εὐημερίας α[ἴ]τ[ι]ạι κατέστησαν Ῥωμαίοις (II 6-9). An ensuing section of the papyrus, column III, then goes on to explain where the Massaliotes derived their tactical superiority from: "they were instructed by historical tradition about the formation employed at Artemision by Herakleides, a Mylasian by birth, outstanding among his contemporaries because of his intelligence" (Ο]ị [Μα]σσαλιῶται προιστο[ρη]κότες τὴν συμβο[λή]ν, ἣν ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι [φα]σὶν Ἡρακλείδην ποι[ήσ]ασθαι τόμ Μυλασσέ[α μ]ὲν τῶι γένει, διαφέ[ρον]τα δ' ἀγχινοίαι τῶγ καθ' αὑτὸν ἀνδρῶν). Imitating Herakleides' *diekplous*-tactic the Massaliotes succeeded, as he once did, in beating the 'Phoenicians' at their own game.

The parallel between the naval tactics used by Herakleides and those used by the Massaliotes is given appropriate attention in Sosylos' account (cf. III 23-25:Ὅπερ ἐποίησε κἀκεῖνο<ς> ἐπὶ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν καιρῶν) and stressed by a strikingly similar evaluation of the respective merits of the parties on each of the occasions: on account of his tactical skills used ἐπὶ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν καιρῶν Herakleides is praised as the man who κατέστη τῆς νίκης αἴτιος. The recurrence of this very phrase in Sosylos' appraisal of the Massaliotes in II 6-9 (α[ἴ]τ[ι]ạι κατέστησαν) is surely not unintentional and reveals an author who is at pains to strengthen by all available means the correspondence between the events in question. His emphasis of the similarity between the two events is clearly the author's way of imparting the message that the Massaliotes behaved in a manner worthy of the finest representatives within their 'Greek' tradition. This is, indeed, what he is about to reaffirm in a seemingly concluding note at the end of column III: Τότε δ', ὥσπερ εἰρήκαμ[εν] οἱ Μασσαλιῶται μνήμηι προγενεστέρων καὶ κατωρθωμένων πράξεων ἐπακολουθοῦντες ...("On that occasion, as we have said, following their memory of successful achievements in the past...")

Although comparisons are a typical ingredient of ἐπιμετροῦντες λόγοι in general[48], it will be worthwhile, in order to properly evaluate the methods and procedures adopted by the historian Sosylos, to consider his text within the wider perspective of the tradition of

---

[48] See Pédech (1964: 408-410).

Greek historiographical writing about the West. The strong—but, admittedly, all but obvious—links established between the late third century B.C. sea-battle and the famous naval episode in the Persian Wars fought in the Euboean straits in 480 B.C. are in themselves reminiscent of a familiar pattern. The tendency to draw parallels between all crucial events in the history of the West and those in metropolitan Greece is a well-known characteristic of Western Greek historiography: it can already be observed in Pindar and becomes a standard feature of historiographical tradition in the fourth and third centuries B.C. The links were established by various devices: while Pindar used association[49], Ephoros found a way of connecting events by means of his assumption of a coordinated Persian-Carthaginian master plan to attack the Greeks in both parts of the Mediterranean simultaneously. Timaios, for his part, made ample use of the device of synchronizing[50]. Against this background one can imagine a literary man like Sosylos being keen to find his own 'Eastern' parallel for the Ebro battle. Given the previous 'classical' links—all relating to the struggle of the Greeks against the Persians—and given the 'Phoenician' opponents of the Massaliote Greeks, he went through the tradition of the Persian wars and appears to have found in the Herakleides-story an episode bearing sufficient tactical resemblance for him to draw a parallel. In the present state of our knowledge, the question must be left open as to whether Sosylos read the story in S.'s monograph or became aware of it through some collection of *Stratagems*. The latter option is perhaps the more likely, since Sosylos, in his capacity as Hannibal's teacher and companion[51], may be expected to have been well-acquainted with this kind of tactical literature, which undoubtedly must have appealed to the Carthaginian[52].

The chronological distance, however, of more than two and a half centuries between the Artemision and the Ebro sea-battles confronted Sosylos with a special problem: he could not avail himself of the common devices identified above for drawing parallels between

---

[49] PINDAR. *Pyth.* 1, 70-80 recalls the battles of Kyme (474 B.C.) and Himera (480 B.C.) along with the victories at Plataea and Salamis. Cf. BURTON (1962: 105-106). See also KIERDORF (1966: 29ff.; 41-43); AMELING (1993: 18-21).

[50] Ephoros' (*FGrHist* 70 F 186) and Timaios' (cf. DIOD. 11, 24.1) accounts of the battle of Himera are analysed by AMELING (1993: 26-33). Cf. also SCHEPENS (1994: 266-267), with bibliography.

[51] *FGrHist* 176 T 1 = NEPOS, *Hann.* 13, 3.

[52] See SEIBERT (1993b: 31-33) and ZECCHINI (1997). On Hannibal's outstanding record as a military genius in later tradition, see LIV. 35, 14. 5-12; APPIAN., *Sy* 38-39; PLUT., *Flam.* 21; PLUT., *Pyrrh.* 8. 5; cf. LÉVÊQUE (1957: 654-660); BRODERSEN (1991: 104-106); SEIBERT (1993a: 57-82).

events in West and East. In the present case only "historical memory" could help to bridge the gap, and that is why we find this concept playing a role in Sosylos' account: the μνήμη of the Massaliotes at III 29 echoes the foregoing more emphatic προιστορηκότες of col. III 3-4. Προιστορέω is a rather special verb used to state that the Massaliotes recalled the particulars of Herakleides' action. As a matter of fact, the phrase is apter for describing Sosylos' own 'preparatory historical enquiry' than the act of remembering ascribed to the Massaliot captains: the one and only reason why they are represented in this way can be none other than the historian's endeavour to link their sea-battle with the celebrated naval engagement in the Persian wars. Still, the device used remains remarkably artificial, and the Massaliotes will surely have been surprised themselves to read how they were, rather unrealistically, engaged in searching their historical memories before giving battle to the Carthaginian fleet[53].

At the end of this rather lengthy 'circumnavigation' of the Mediterranean in search of the right 'Artemision' we come then to the following conclusions. Firstly, as we lack positive evidence for either a Carian or an Iberian Artemision, speculations about hypothetical places with this name seem a waste of time and should be dismissed as attempts at explaining *obscurum per obscurius*[54]. Secondly, the evaluative frame of thought in which Sosylos inserted his Artemision-reference is bound to make any option other than the famous battle in Euboean waters a priori unlikely: hailed within Greek tradition as a "cornerstone" in the struggle for freedom[55], 'Artemision' qualified as an obvious term of comparison for exalting the Massaliotes' fighting as worthy of their forefathers' great successes[56]. Thirdly, Sosylos' laudatory—and maybe historically exaggerated—assessment of the Massa-

---

[53] The interpretation given here of προιστορηκότες fully endorses G.A. Lehmann's ironising and perceptive remarks: "Und i h r Sieg über die Karthager beruht auf nicht weniger als einer glücklichen historischen Erinnerung an ein Strategem aus der Zeit der glorreichen Seeschlachten des Xerxeszuges ... Offenkundig soll ja doch Sosylos' gelehrte Notiz zur Person des Herakleides von Mylasa die kühne Verknüpfung der Seeschlacht an der Ebro-Mündung mit der grossen Zeit der Perserkriege regelrecht belegen und legitimieren." See Lehmann (1974: 177-178), with appropriate comments on Sosylos' εὐχερεία and on the rather dubious authenticity of the 'historical tradition' rendered by him (p. 179-182). But Sosylos' obvious bias and embellishments do not necessarily entail Polybios' credibility or justify the despising arrogance of his criticism (*FGrHist* 176 T 3 = Polyb. 3, 20.5).

[54] Compare Lehmann (1974: 178).

[55] See Pindar. *Dith.* fr. 77 Bergk.

[56] It should be borne in mind that Sosylos' *History of Hannibal*, no doubt, primarily aimed at reporting Hannibal's struggle with the Romans to a Greek audience.

liotes' vital contribution to the Roman victory certainly betrays the anti-Roman bias of his historical work. However, his glorification of the Greek tradition need not necessarily be incompatible with the pro-Carthaginian tendency of his account. Being an indisputable fact of history, the defeat of Hasdrubal's fleet was not concealed by him, but explained. Having stated that the Carthaginians did not live up, on that occasion, to the most brilliant record of their πρόγονοι (I 9-14)—a term which in the context may include the 'Phoenicians'[57]—, Sosylos was careful to point out that they only were retreating after having faced the moment of ultimate danger (ἀνεχώ[ρουν εἰς τ]ὸν ἔσχατον [ἐλθόντε]ς κίνδυνον) (I 24-26). Last but not least, the vanquished, if they so wished, could read into Sosylos' account some kind of excuse: after all, their Phoenician ancestors had, in perfectly analogous circumstances, experienced a similar setback when, lined up in the Persian fleet off Artemision, they saw themselves out-manoeuvred by the clever Herakleides. By reenacting his stratagem the Massaliotes made history repeat itself. Seen in this light, Sosylos' resourceful manipulation of the Herakleides-story was a device that served more than one purpose.

If, as has been shown, the sea-battle off Artemision in the Euboean straits is the only reasonable option left for Sosylos' historical precedent, a few words should still be added about the much-debated (and exaggerated) problem of Herodotos' silence about Herakleides' *diekplous*-manoeuvre in 480 B.C. Why Herodotos, who elsewhere in his work mentions both S. of Karyanda[58] and Herakleides, was less talkative about the exploit than we would expect him to be is a question to which there can be no definite answer: the historian from Halikarnassos, in spite of his impressively rich and detailed account, must have known still a great many more individuals and stories than those he mentions in his *Histories*.

Although one can only speculate about the reasons why Herodotos has nothing to say concerning Herakleides' alleged tactical genius and prowess, I shall nonetheless make two suggestions. The first is that, in reality, the Carian's role may have been much less impressive than the version Sosylos conjures up in his parallel to the Ebro-battle. One can reasonably suspect that Sosylos' (ultimate) source, S. of Karyan-

---

[57] Cf. Bilabel (1922: 31).

[58] Besides Hekataios Skylax is the only 'logographer' mentioned by Herodotos (see Herodot. 2 143; 5, 36; 5, 125; 6, 137), albeit as an explorer and not as an author (see Herodot. 4, 44).

da, may already have presented an embellished account featuring Herakleides as a Carian national hero, possibly for reasons of propaganda[59]. A second, and closely related observation is that Herodotos, basing himself on Athenian informants, may have been more intent on glorifying the contribution of the Athenians[60]. In his narrative, then, he may have felt that it was unnecessary and/or inappropriate (whether for personal, political or compository reasons) to single out Herakleides' manoeuvre as something relevant to the story he wanted to tell[61]. This being said, it is important to note that Herodotos' account of the battle on the first day does not preclude the possibility of Herakleides' action, even if it remains difficult to tell whether the tactic described by the *pater historiae* matches that described by Sosylos[62].

Not a single fragment survives from S.' *Stories about Herakleides*. What we can elicit about their contents from Herodotos (5, 121-122; 5, 37) and Sosylos F1—although without achieving any kind of certainty, since neither of these authors can be shown to have used S.' work directly as a source—revolves around two nuclei. Firstly, S. most probably narrated Herakleides' actions against the Persians as leader of the Carian forces during the Ionian-Carian uprising (499-496 B.C.). The other highlight was his naval manoeuvre at Artemision against the Phoenician ships. Since by 480 B.C. Herakleides was fighting on the Greek side (whereas the Carian navy remained incorporated into

---

59 Cf. BENGTSON (1954/55: 306-307). This is perhaps why the victory in Sosylos' account (III 23-27) turns out to be an undecided battle in HERODOT., 8, 11.

60 As assumed by BENGTSON (1954/55: 305-306).

61 Cf. ALLAIN (1977: 64-65). Some critics, arguing *e silentio,* have drawn the conclusion that Herodotos was not aware of S.'s book on Herakleides: see LEGRAND (1946: 58-59 n. 2); PERETTI (1983: 89). Such inference is neither compelling nor likely: as BENGTSON (1954/55: 305) has observed, Herodotos' remarkable recollection of details, such as the names of all three Persian generals, in his account of Herakleides' military action in Karia during the Ionian revolt, points rather to a written than to an oral source (HERODOT. 5, 121).

62 See KOESTER (1934: 81-96, esp. 92-96); cf. BENGTSON (1954/55: 301-302). But given the substantial differences of views between Herodotos and Sosylos, as outlined above, it would be rather ill-advised to try to use the account of the latter to historically supplement the narrative of former. Cf. HIGNETT (1963: 396) and, for slightly different reasons, also TARN (1908: 216-217). LEHMANN (1974: 178-179) strongly stresses the incompatibility of the two accounts and draws from it the rather unlikely conclusion that—since Herodotos apparently knew and used S.'s work on Herakleides in his account of the Carian-Ionian uprising (cf. HERODOT., 5, 37 & 121)—the 'Skylax-Biographie' most probably did not deal explicitly with Herakleides' feat at Artemision. As a corollary the latter tradition is assumed by him to be a "nachherodoteische Version".

the Persian fleet), it is a reasonable guess that after the collapse of the Ionian revolt he may have come to Greece, and most probably to Athens[63] along with other Carian refugees. Herakleides seems to have been successful in both of his enterprises. Furthermore, as Wilcken[64] already pointed out, his routing of an entire Persian army group en route to Pedason by the use of a stratagem (see Herod. 5, 121) seems to have an inner affinity with the tactical cleverness shown at Artemision. Both events shed equal light on the characterisation of the man by Sosylos as διαφέρων ἀγχινοίαι τῶγ καθ' αὑτὸν ἀνδρῶν (column III, l. 8). It may be tempting—although this is, in the present state of our knowledge, undoubtedly an unwarranted step—to suppose that both events were described by S. with a view to characterising his fellow-countryman and contemporary as a kind of Carian Themistokles. Such an account might point to a 'biographical' trait in the stories told by S., if only we could be sure that the phrase διαφέρων ἀγχινοίαι was, indeed, part of the original story told by S. (and not added by Sosylos or his 'stratagematic' source). The little we can surmise about the contents of S.'s work hardly suffices to substantiate any specific claims about its scope and character. In order to justify speculation about its 'biographical' nature we would also need to know at least something about the larger context in which the two 'stories' were inserted. As a matter of principle, the function and meaning of any segment of a narrative should be judged from the nature of the entire work and not *vice versa*.

Yet, if mere repetition of a hypothesis were an argument, a strong case could be made for considering S.'s work on Herakleides to have been a biography. A variety of commentators have called it either 'a sort of biography'[65], or, quite simply, a *bios* or 'biography'[66], or have even assigned S. the rank of 'first biographer in Greek literature."[67] Whereas most of these contentions are made without any attempt at

---

[63] Cf. Bengtson (1954/55).

[64] Wilcken (1906: esp. p. 119-127).

[65] While phrases like Drews (1973: 34) "biographical essay" or (Peretti 1979: 64) "un specie di bios" would seem to suggest something less than a full-fledged biography (cf. also Momigliano 1971: 29), Legrand (1946: 58-59 n. 2), for his part, believes that the work, given its title, Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, was "quelque chose de plus ample qu'une simple biographie".

[66] Bengtson (1954/55: *passim*, yet once with the alternative 'Volksbuch': p. 305); Manganaro (1959: 286); Drews (1973: 35); Lehmann (1974: 177-178); Virgilio (1975: 131); Hofstetter (1978: 164-165);

[67] Mazzarino (1966: 83-87), Momigliano (1971: 29-30; 36-38; 44) and, in their wake, also Peretti (1979: 2 with n. 3; 64-66; and 1983: 89); Hornblower (1982: 21).

justification, some scholars at least have taken care to mention possible alternatives or have answered the question as to the character of the work with a *non liquet*[68]. The most straightforward affirmation of the work's biographical character is found in Peretti's introduction. Apparently capitalizing on Sosylos' characterization of Herakleides as διαφέ[ρον]τα δ' ἀγχινοίαι τῶγ καθ' αὑτὸν ἀνδρῶν, he writes: "Egli (*scil.* S. of Karyanda) dimostrave così di avere intuito il valore unico, incomparabile di una personalità superiore, il significato non solo ideale e paradigmatico ma anchè storico dell' *areté* dell' individuo."[69] This statement is made with explicit reference to Momigliano's views, yet without giving consideration to the circumspection with which the latter had developed his case for considering S. to be the first (or one of the first authors) to have written "biographies according to the definition of a biography as an account of a life from birth to death."[70]

Presented in this form, the biographical thesis, even if argued with caution, goes far beyond the evidence available. For that matter, the very general and speculative way in which Momigliano himself was led to argue his case is illustrative enough of the troublesome lack of positive evidence[71] for his view. Even if one can agree with his bottom line, namely that interest in biographical details was greater in Asia Minor than in Greece proper, such a view still fails to prove anything specific about the nature of S.'s work on Herakleides[72]. Still, Momigliano's idea that "biography might have been born among scatterbrained Ionian sailors" stands out as a stimulating, though un-

---

68 Rühl (1906: 354 n. 1) leaves the question unanswered as to whether "es sich um eine Art von Biographie oder um ein Werk über Karien gehandelt hat".

69 Peretti (1979, p. 2 and n. 3),

70 Momigliano (1971: 28-29; 32; 36-38; 44) and (1990: 15). Although Momigliano's views on S.'s biographical work have much in common with Mazzarino (1966, 83-87), he fails to mention the contribution of his predecessor.

71 Momigliano himself is perfectly aware of this handicap, but draws from the 'warning' it contains some justification for approaching the ambiguous and meagre fifth century b.c. evidence for biographies and autobiographies in a positive, speculative mood (Momigliano 1971: 23-42, esp. 32). This leads to an interesting—yet not in all respects convincing—backward extension of the history of Greek biography, opposing the traditional theory propounded by Leo (1901) that Greek biography was a Peripatetic invention.

72 Momigliano's (1971: 28-33) far-reaching hypothesizing about historiographical developments and inter-cultural exchanges is, at least in part, open to criticism. Cf. Walbank (1973: 233-236), who rightly points out some weaknesses in Momigliano's historiographical argument, including some degree of circular reasoning.

proved challenge to the heavy-handed evolutionary theories of the past[73].

The only piece of evidence at our disposal—the title Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα—is the sober starting-point for considering S.'s work primarily as a contemporary historical monograph "über die Ereignisse zur Zeit des Herakleides"[74]. Considering the neutral plural τὰ κατά—and considering the use of this and similar phrases in titles of many later historical monographs centering on an individual—one might, indeed, be inclined rather to think of the work under discussion as of an early specimen of a historical monograph: "The *story* [or *Stories*] about the king Herakleides of Mylasa." If, as Gisinger explains, S.'s work should be viewed primarily as 'historical', the expression of biographical interest in the figure of Herakleides ought not to be denied within this framework: it appears as a byproduct of the laudatory treatment of the facts, focusing, with strong patriotic bias, on Herakleides' feats of arms[75]. Setting out from the title Homeyer too declared herself in favour of a historical monograph[76]. As for scholars of an earlier generation, Müller and Jacoby were thinking along similar lines when they objected to the possible authenticity of a *particularis historia* at such an early stage in the development of Greek historiography[77]. One could perhaps, as a concession to both collectors of historical fragments, concede that it is, indeed, somewhat anachronistic to label as a monograph a work written at the beginning of the fifth century B.C.. Such a terminological qualification admittedly derives its proper meaning only from the contrast with 'general' history, the description of κοιναὶ πράξεις. The distinction in genre between 'monographs' and general historical works, which was current at the time of Polybius, may not have been

---

[73] Compare B.E. Perry's challenging statement on the birth of Greek romance as a literary form: "The first romance was deliberately planned and written by an individual author, its inventor. He conceived it on a Tuesday afternoon in July, or on some other day or month of the year." (PERRY 1967: 175).

[74] GISINGER (1927: 634-635)

[75] Compare also WILCKEN (1906: 126); VON GUTSCHMID (1893: 142).

[76] HOMEYER (1962: 82 n. 1): opposing the suggestion that it was a "Volksbuch" (SCHMID – STÄHLIN 1929: 702), she writes: "Die Titelfassung läßst eine Geschichtserzählung vermuten, zumal noch Sosylos Herakleides erwähnt."

[77] Cf. MÜLLER, *GGM* I, *Proleg.*, p. XXXVIII: *Scylacem vero logographum particularem historiam scripsisse de rebus gestis veri coaetani, a veteris logographiae ratione, qualem novimus, tam alienum est, ut, si testata res esset, magnopere miraremur...*"

fully conceptualised until some point in the fourth century B.C.[78]. For this reason all categorisation proves problematic when applied to early writings. As an early literary composition describing—not an entire life but—some brave deeds of an individual, S.'s work can be seen as the counterpart in prose to a long-standing tradition of description (and celebration) of historical events in *e.g.* Greek lyric poetry from the seventh century B.C. onwards[79]. Thus, Mimnermos dealt in his narrative elegy Σμυρνηΐς with the campaign of the Lydian king Gyges against Smyrna. An extant fragment describes how one of the Smyrnaean foot-soldiers drove back the Lydian cavalry[80]. Ktisis-poetry, in particular, provided a suitable context for all sorts of proto-historic descriptions[81].

Bengtson has made some plausible suggestions in regard to the possible aims which S. may have been pursuing in his work on Herakleides and also in regard to the circumstances of its composition: S. may have written his work as a Carian refugee in Athens[82], at some date between 479 and 469. His aim may have been to remind the Greeks that Karia was still not free. Although Bengtson did not succeed in proving his specific point, namely, that the Skylax, father of Tymnes of Karia, mentioned in a bilingual Greek-Carian inscription found in 1954 in the Themistoklean wall, may well be the author of the work on Herakleides[83], the inscription, nevertheless testifies that Karians

---

[78] At that time historiographical theory became a suitable topic for discussion: see SCHEPENS (1990: 39-61, esp. p. 39-40). On universal history *versus* historical monograph, see MOHM (1977: 68-91) (with bibliography).

[79] MAZZARINO (1966: 37-52); LASSERRE (1976: 113-142). Longer narrative elegies were performed in a prize-winning contest on the occasion of public feasts in the Greek cities: see BOWIE (1986: 13-35) and DOUGHERTY (1994: 35-46). A useful general survey of 'historical' themes in Greek lyric poetry can be found in CAMPBELL (1983: esp. p. 84-118).

[80] Fr. 13 and 13a WEST. The poet claims to have got this information from his (fore)fathers, who actually witnessed this brave feat: see Fr. 14 West. It is, however, uncertain whether the fragment can be safely ascribed to the *Smyrneïs;* see ALLEN (1993: 9-10). On the *Smyrneïs* in general and fr. 14 West (= F 15 Allen) in particular, see *ibidem*, p. 23-26; 110-115; 116-122.

[81] See, for instance, *Semonides*' Ἀχαιολογία Σαμίων (*Suda* Σ 431; cf. *FGrHist* 534 T 1) and *Archilochus* (fr. 293 West): cf. POUILLOUX (1963). On κτίσις-poetry in general, see most recently DOUGHERTY (1993).

[82] Although S. had been a loyal Persian subject in the past, who made his sea voyage on orders and in the pay of Dareios, it is generally assumed that the work celebrating Herakleides as a Carian resistance hero, can hardly have been written within the 'Persian' realm.

[83] See *SEG* 13, 36; JEFFERY (1962, esp. p. 126) objected that such identification is rather questionable on chronological grounds; cf. also HORNBLOWER (1982: 20 with n. 117).

were present in Athens during S.' lifetime. Bengtson's suggestions, therefore, remain an appealing solution[84].

To conclude this commentary on S.'s Τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, Bury's succinct and judicious assessment, dating back to 1908, may still be quoted as one of the most adequate made in this century: "How far that work was what can be called biographical we cannot tell, but it is at least noteworthy as the earliest Greek book we know of that made an individual the centre of a historical narrative."[85]

Guido Schepens

[84] Cf. Allain (1977: 59-60, 65).
[85] Bury (1909: 25).

Text editions and translations

* A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* IV (Lexicographi Graeci 1), Leipzig 1935 (= Stuttgart 1971).

Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote. Histoires. Livre V* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1946.

C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum,* III, Paris 1849.

C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores*, I, Paris 1855 (= Hildesheim 1965).

F. Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus*, Bonn 1922, p. 29-33 [Sosylos].

U. Wilcken, *Ein Sosylos-Fragment in der Würzburger Papyrussammlung*, in *Hermes* 41 (1906), p. 103-141.

Secondary literature

M. Allain, *The Periplous of Skylax of Karyanda*, The Ohio State University Ph.D. 1977.

A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus. Text and Commentary*, Stuttgart 1993.

W. Ameling, *Karthago. Studien zu Militär, Staat und Gesellschaft,* München 1993.

H. Bengtson, *Skylax von Karyanda und Herakleides von Mylasa*, in *Historia* 3 (1954/5), p. 301-307 (= *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Geschichte*, München 1974, p. 141-148).

P. Bosch-Gimpera, *Una guerra fra Cartaginesi e Greci in Spagna. La ignorata battaglia di Artemision*, in *RFIC* 78 n.s. 28 (1950), p. 313-325 [Spanish version in *Cuadernos de Historia primitiva* 5 (1950), p. 43-55].

P. Bosch-Gimpera, *Phéniciens et Grecs dans l'Extrême-Occident*, in *La nouvelle Clio* 3 (1951), p. 269-296.

E.L. Bowie, *Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival,* in *JHS* 106 (1986), p. 13-35.

K. Brodersen, *Appians Antiochike,* München 1991.

R.W.D. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford 1962.

D.A. Campbell, *The Golden Lyre. The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets,* London 1983.

C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization. From City to Text in Archaic Greece,* Oxford 1993.

C. Dougherty, *Archaic Greek Foundation Poetry: Questions of Genre and Occasion,* in *JHS* 114 (1994), p. 35-46.

R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History,* Cambridge (Mass.) 1973.

C. Ferone, *Il frammento di Sosilo sulla battaglia dell' Ebro del 217 A.C. (F. GR. HIST. 176 FR. 1),* in M. Capasso (ed.), *Papiri letterari greci e latini*, Galatina 1992, p. 125-139.

R.L. Fowler, *Herodotos and His Contemporaries,* in *JHS* 116 (1996), p. 62-87.

F. Gisinger, art. *Skylax* (2), in *RE* 3A,1 (1927), col. 619-646 (esp. col. 634-635).

C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece,* Oxford 1963, with *Appendix VII: A Fragment of Sosylos* (p. 393-396).

S. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, Oxford 1982.

W. Huss, *Geschichte der Karthager*, München 1985.

L.H. Jeffery, *The Inscribed Gravestones of Archaic Attica,* in *ABSA* 57 (1962), p. 115-153.

W. Kierdorf, *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege. Studien zu Simonides, Pindar, Aischylos und den attischen Rednern,* Göttingen 1966.

A. Köster, *Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Seewesens*, Leipzig 1934.

F. Lasserre, *L'historiographie grecque à l'époque archaïque*, in *QS* 4 (1976), p. 113-142.

G.A. Lehmann, *Polybios und die ältere und zeitgenössische griechische Geschichtsschreibung: einige Bemerkungen,* in *Polybe*, Vandœuvres - Genève 1974, p. 145-205.

P. Lévêque, *Pyrrhos*, Paris 1957.

F.G. Maier, *Factoids in Ancient History: The Case of Fifth Century Cyprus,* in *JHS* 105 (1985), p. 32-39.

G. Manganaro, *Ancora del papiro di Sosylos e dei Cari in Occidente*, in *PP* 14 (1959), p. 283-290.

S. Mazzarino, *Introduzione alle guerre puniche*, Catania 1947.

S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico,* I, Bari 1966.

S. Mohm, *Untersuchungen zu den historiographischen Anschauungen des Polybios,* Diss. Saarbrücken 1977.

A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography,* Berkeley - Los Angeles - Oxford, 1990.

J.A.R. Munro, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, in J.B. Bury, S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History*, IV. *The Persian Empire and the West,* Cambridge 1926 [repr. with slight corrections 1930 and 1939].

B.G. Niebuhr, *Über das Alter des Küstenbeschreibers Skylax von Karyanda*, Berlin 1815 (read in 1810), p. 83-99 (= *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*, I, 1828, p. 105-131.

E. Olshausen, *Einführung in die historische Geographie der alten Welt,* Darmstadt 1991.

M. Pallottino, *Een laars vol scherven. De vroegste geschiedenis van Italia,* Amsterdam 1987 (= *Storia della prima Italia*, Milano 1984).

P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe*, Paris 1964.

A. Peretti, *Il periplo di Scilace. Studio sul primo portolano del Mediterraneo*, Pisa 1979.

A. Peretti, *I peripli arcaici e Scilace di Carianda,* in F. Prontera (ed.), *Geografia e geografi nel mondo antico. Guida storica e critica,* Roma - Bari 1983, p. 69-114.

B.E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances,* Berkeley - Los Angeles 1967.

J. Pouilloux, *Archiloque et Thasos: histoire et poésie*, in *Archiloque,* Vandœuvres - Genève 1963, p. 1-27; 28-36.

P. Rouillard, *Les Grecs et la péninsule ibérique du VIII*e *au IV*e *siècle avant Jésus Christ,* Paris 1991.

F. Rühl, *Herakleides von Mylasa*, in *RhM* 61 (1906), p. 352-359.

G. Schepens, *Polemic and Methodology in Polybius' Book XII,* in H. Verdin – G. Schepens – E. De Keyser (ed.), *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.*, Leuven 1990, p. 39-61.

G. Schepens, *Politics and Belief in Timaeus of Tauromenium*, in *AncSoc* 25 (1994), p. 249-278.

J. Seibert, *Forschungen zu Hannibal,* Darmstadt 1993 (= 1993a).

J. Seibert, *Hannibal,* Darmstadt 1993 (=1993b).

J. Sundwall, art. *Herakleides* (18), in *RE* 8,1 (1912), col. 459.
W.W. Tarn, *The Fleet of Xerxes,* in *JHS* 28 (1908), p. 201-233.
B. Virgilio, *Commento storico al Quinto Libro delle "Storie" di Erodoto. Introduzione, commento storico, note complementari, testo, traduzione e indici,* Pisa 1975.
A. von Gutschmid, *Skylax von Karyanda*, in *RhM* N.F., 9 (1854), p. 141-146 (= *Kleine Schriften*, IV, Leipzig 1893, p. 139-144).
G. J. Vossius, *De historicis graecis libri IV,* I, Leiden 1623.
F.W. Walbank, rec. Momigliano (1971), in *History and Theory* 12 (1973) 230-240.
U. Wilcken, *Zu Sosylos*, in *Hermes* 42 (1907), p. 510-512.
G. Zecchini, *Ancora sul Papiro Würzburg e su Sosilo*, in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995* (= *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Beiheft 3), p. 1061-1067.

1001 (= 765). Xanthos of Lydia
(end 6th (?)–5th cent. B.C.)

F

(ΤΑ) ΠΕΡΙ ΕΜΠΕΔΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ

1 (*FGrHist* 765 F 33) Diog. Laert. 8,63: Φησὶ δ' αὐτὸν (*sc.* τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα; F 31[21].A.1 Diels – Kranz) καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης (F 66 Rose; Ross, Soph. F 2; F 865 Gigon) ἐλεύθερον γεγονέναι καὶ πάσης ἀρχῆς ἀλλότριον, εἴ γε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῷ διδομένην παρῃτήσατο, καθάπερ Ξάνθος ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγει, τὴν λιτότητα δηλονότι πλέον ἀγαπήσας.

1001 (= 765). Xanthos of Lydia

(end 6th (?)–5th cent. B.C.)

F

(A WORK / PASSAGE) ON EMPEDOKLES

1 Aristotle too says he (*sc.* Empedokles) was a champion of freedom and averse to any form of authoritarian rule, if indeed he declined the kingship when it was offered to him, as Xanthos relates in his account of him, obviously because he preferred a frugal life.

1001 (= 765). Xanthos of Lydia

(end 6th (?)-5th cent. B.C.)

F

(A WORK / PASSAGE) ON EMPEDOKLES

(1) Ever since the critical study of antiquity was awakened early in the 19th century, this passage has been attracting the attention of classical scholars. The bibliography reflects a large array of possible readings and interpretations. It is comforting and worth noting, however, that progress towards a solution of this "trifling question"[1] seems to have been made. Whereas previous generations of scholars tended to be unduly sceptical about the historicity of X.[2], Kingsley, in a recent contribution[3], has made out a convincing case for the authenticity of the (Aristotelian) reference to a genuine X., who can be no other than Empedokles' contemporary X. of Lydia[4] (cf. already *FGrHist* 765 F 33). This is not to say, however, that a scholarly consensus on how to edit the text of the fragment and how to solve the difficulties of interpretation which it raises, is within reach. Our apparent inability to reconstruct with any degree of certainty the multi-

---

[1] Cf. PEARSON (1939: 119).

[2] ZIEGLER (1967) treated the author of a "Schrift über Empedokles" under a separate number. Many scholars vaguely referred to an unknown X., e.g. VON GUTSCHMID (1893: 310); GEFFCKEN Ib (1926: 244 n. 28); SCHMID (1929: 315 n. 6) and VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (1929: 653 n. 1 = 1935: 510 n.1). Some authors thought on the basis of ATHEN. 12,515 d-e (*FGrHist* 765 T 5) that the passage was taken from the pseudo-X. Dionysios Scytobrachion; see e.g. WELCKER (1844: 443-444) and PEARSON (1939: 119). Others took him to be a namesake of the Lydian X.: CREUZER (1806: 228), following Jonsius, assigned the fragment to X. of Athens; BIDEZ (1894: 58) thought he could have been X., the son of Timon of Phleios, while e.g. VON GUTSCHMID (1893: 308; 315) and SCHMID (1929: 707) suggested that there may have been some confusion with the legendary Samian philosopher X. Still within the confusion-theory, DE WAELE (1971: 169 n. 856) and MEISTER (1978: 292) seem to have exceeded the limits set by sound palaeographic method, in assuming that X. may be a false reading of a scribe for Neanthes, who is mentioned several times by Diogenes Laertios as a biographer of Empedokles.

[3] KINGSLEY (1995), esp. p. 185-191 for the fragment under discussion and p. 176-183 for arguments against the theory of a pseudo-X.

[4] Empedokles' life can be situated between 495/2 and 435/2; cf. GUTHRIE (1965: 128 with n. 2); WRIGHT (1981: 3-6); KIRK – RAVEN – SCHOFIELD (1983[2]: 281). See also JACOBY's comm. on *FGrHist* 244 F 32a-b. Most scholars think that X. wrote after 425 B.C., e.g. JACOBY (*FGrHist* III C, p. 750); DREWS (1973: 193 n. 9) and FOWLER (1996: 64). Others situate his productive period in the late fifties or forties of the 5th cent. B.C.; cf. HERTER (1967: 1354) and KINGSLEY (1995: 176).

layered history of fragmentation that hides behind the cover-text[5] in Diogenes Laertios remains a basic weakness inherent in all solutions, including the one that will be tentatively offered here.

The basic finding to start from is that there seems to be evidence for the view that Aristotle himself constitutes a first, crucial link in the history of fragmentation[6]. Although none of the arguments adduced by Kingsley are compelling on their own, their cumulative force points in favour of the assumption that the peripatetic philosopher was acquainted with X.'s work[7]. Setting out from Aristotle, then, there are, roughly speaking, two possible ways of tracing the history of the transmission of the fragment until it reaches Diogenes Laertios.

---

[5] For this notion, see SCHEPENS (1997: 166-167 n. 66).

[6] Several authors seem to accept it as self-evident that X. was quoted by Aristotle; e.g. BIDEZ – CUMONT I (1938: 238 n. 2); GUTHRIE (1965: 131 n. 1); LAMBRIDIS (1976: 12) and ASHERI (1990: 493 n. 28). Some scholars hold a different view. JACOBY (*app. crit.* with *FGrHist* 765 F 33) suggested that the phrase εἴ γε… λέγει might be an "einschub in das Aristoteleszitat". The nominative case of ἀγαπήσας, however, acts counter to this suggestion, unless of course the intermediary source which was responsable for the interpolation changed the case of the participle to make it correspond to the subject of παρῃτήσατο. BROWN (1958: 52) and, recently, VATTUONE (1991: 118) also made a neat distinction between the portions of text to be attributed to Aristotle, on the one hand, and to X. on the other. But they considered the phrase εἴ γε…παρῃτήσατο as belonging to the Aristotle-fragment and the detail about a frugal life as being from X. Afterwards BROWN (1988: 27) seems to have been convinced by GUTHRIE (1965: 131 n.1) that the whole fragment is to be taken as Aristotelian.

[7] DIOG. LAERT. 8,57 (= ARISTOTLE F 70 ROSE = ROSS, *De poet.* F 1 = F 17 GIGON) informs us that Aristotle knew about some poems which Empedokles had written; among them an unfinished poem on Xerxes' expedition to Greece. While MOMIGLIANO (1971: 31) simply stated that X. seems to be "the obvious source" for this "tantalising piece of information", KINGSLEY (1995: 190) gives some evidence in support of this view. In the first two points advanced by him—X. had already said things about Empedokles elsewhere (*sc.* in the fragment under consideration) and Aristotle used X. in order to give details about this philosopher—the danger of a circular argument looms large. His other arguments are more convincing. The anecdote about Empedokles' sister burning her brother's work, is in perfect harmony with X.'s "novellistic style and his highly evident 'fondness for anecdote'". In Lydia, X. was in an ideal position to collect information about Xerxes' expedition, seeing that it was at Sardis that Xerxes prepared his crossing of the Hellespont. And finally, the phrase ἡ Ξέρξου διάβασις—the linguistic form of which has its origin in fifth-century Asia Minor— appears in another Xanthian fragment as well, namely DIOG. LAERT. 1,2 (*FGrHist* 765 F 32), where X. of Lydia is said to have counted 6000 years from Zoroaster to Xerxes' expedition. The objection that later Greek writers used Xerxes' crossing as a 'stakepost' or a fixed chronological point of reference, is met with by Kingsley as follows: the expression ἡ Ξέρξου διάβασις in all of its occurrences goes back to the third-century scholar Eratosthenes, "who, in his attempts at schematizing chronology, happens to have been heavily indebted to none other than Xanthus of Lydia".

(1) Diogenes is quoting directly from Aristotle, and takes over from him not only the statement on Empedokles as a champion of freedom, but also the reference to X., which in Aristotle's text was adduced in support of this very view. The most likely assumption that goes with this 'solution' is that Aristotle quoted X. for *all the information* contained in the text of Diogenes Laertios (until ἀγαπήσας). The reference to Empedokles' frugal life style would then be an integral part of the information Aristotle derived from X.'s work on Empedokles. The detail on the latter's way of life could be grist to the mill of those who are tempted to consider X.'s work on Empedokles to be biographical in nature[8].

(2) The second option is that Diogenes Laertios is not quoting from Aristotle directly but through one (or more) intermediary source(s). In this case the picture of what may have happened to Aristotle's quotation of X. is likely to be somewhat more complicated. The text as we have it in Laertios may in substance still reproduce what Aristotle had to say on Empedokles with reference to X. But we are under no obligation to believe that the portion of text which can safely be attributed to Aristotle and X. went beyond the phrase καθάπερ Ξάνθος ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγει, which, indeed, seems to formally end the quote. The participial clause, which lends a biographical flavour to the text, is connected more or less loosely with the main sentence. It may very well have been added by some intermediary source. In view of the reference to Empedokles' lifestyle, it is rather tempting to speculate about a biographer, working with the material he found in Aristotle and trying to improve upon him by adding as "obvious" and supplementary proof, the reference to Empedokles' preference for a frugal life. This additional information need not have been taken from X.—there were many traditions in circulation about Empedokles[9]—but his authorship cannot be excluded. The intermediary source can, of course, only be identified speculatively. Several names of biographers, writing in the period after Aristotle and mentioned in the Empedokles-chapters of Diogenes Laertios, naturally come to mind[10]. Among them Hermippos (*FGrHist* 1026)[11] and Hippobotos

---

[8] See e.g. MOMIGLIANO (1971: 31; 32; 36; 38; 44).

[9] See e.g. PEARSON (1987: 126-128).

[10] Hippobotos (DIOG. LAERT. 8,51; 8,69; 8,72), Hermippos (DIOG. LAERT. 8,51; 8,56; 8,69), Satyros (DIOG. LAERT. 8,53; 8,58-59; 8,60), Neanthes of Kyzikos (DIOG. LAERT. 8,55; 8,58; 8,72) and Hieronymos of Rhodes (DIOG. LAERT. 8, 57-58).

[11] Among the older sources Hermippos is the one Diogenes Laertios most quoted by name; see MEJER (1978: 32).

(*FGrHist* 1039)[12]—both known authors of a biographical work on Empedokles—present themselves as most obvious choices.

The theory that Diogenes Laertios depended on such an intermediary source for his information on Aristotle's and X.'s views on Empedokles is more likely than the assumption that he consulted Aristotle for himself. Apart from Mejer's general conclusion that Diogenes had little or no personal knowledge of Aristotle's works[13], which in itself inspires caution, it is worth noting that in the Empedokles-chapters under discussion Aristotle is cited more than once and the references are taken from different works[14]. It is hard to imagine that Diogenes Laertios would have read himself through several works of Aristotle in order to collect the information relevant to his discussion of Empedokles. It is more in the nature of the working methods of the compilator to have drawn on his usual biographical sources, in which he found the ready-made references to Aristotle (and his sources)[15]. The biographical flavour which characterizes the statement about Empedokles as a champion of freedom may, therefore, very well reflect a later, post-Aristotelian stage in the development of the fragment as we read it in Diogenes Laertios. According to this view, the Xanthos-fragment is not likely to have been drawn from a full-fledged biography. The phrase ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ may not

[12] Cf. e.g. Bidez (1894: 5-20), who argued that the whole Empedokles-life of Diogenes (8,51-77) or the compilator he used, was based upon the Empedokles-chapter in the *Ἀναγραφὴ τῶν φιλοσόφων* of Hippobotos; Leo (1901: 77-80) considers Hippobotos to be the intermediary between the epitome of Herakleides Lembos and Diogenes' Empedokles-vita. Mejer (1978: 12-13) warns against this idea of Hippobotos being the source for all others, but on p. 45 he does include Hippobotos among the authors Diogenes had direct access to. Gigante (1983: 153) thinks that Diogenes did not know Hippobotos at first hand.

[13] See Mejer (1978: 35-36).

[14] Diog. Laert. 8,57: In his *Sophist* Aristotle states that Empedokles invented rhetoric; cf. Diog. Laert. 9,25, where the same notice is given without a booktitle. Diog. Laert. 8,57-58: In his work *On Poets* Aristotle calls Empedokles Ὁμηρικός and enumerates some of his poetic works. In other cases Diogenes refers to Aristotle without giving any titles: Diog. Laert. 8,51: Eratosthenes relates on the authority of Aristotle that Empedokles' grandfather was an Olympic victor; 8,52: Aristotle and Herakleides declare that Empedokles died at the age of 60; cf. Diog. Laert. 8,74, where only Aristotle is mentioned; and finally the fragment under discussion, Diog. Laert. 8,63: Aristotle calls Empedokles a champion of freedom and refers to X.

[15] Cf. Mejer (1978: 29).

even point to an independent work[16], titles other than *Λυδιακά* most probably referring to some section of X.'s major historical work in four books[17].

As to the historical value of the fragment, a number of opinions can be found in modern literature[18].

Some scholars consider the story of Empedokles refusing a kingship as the invention of a biographer[19] or as a literary *topos*[20]. But since we know of only one other philosopher who is said to have refused a kingship, namely Herakleitos of Ephesos, the basis for assuming that a literary *topos* is at work here turns out to be rather small. To view the anecdote as the invention of an individual biographer does not seem convincing either: an invention of this kind would be more characteristic of a Hellenistic biographer and, as we have tried to show above, the information about the refusal most probably comes from X. himself.

---

16 See Tozzi (1965: 184), who assumes that X. referred to Empedokles somewhere in his *Λυδιακά* and who translates Diogenes' expression as "X. in what he says about Empedokles"; cf. Herter (1967: 1354-1355): "Daß Xanthos außer seinem Hauptwerke auch noch eine besondere Schrift über Empedokles verfaßt hätte, ist nicht gerade ausgeschlossen, aber nicht eben wahrscheinlich". Several authors spontaneously make the assumption that it was a work in its own right, see e.g. von Gutschmid (1893: 309-310); Geffcken Ib (1926: 244 n. 28) and Ziegler (1967: 1374), who simply speak about a "Schrift über Empedokles" and Jacoby, *FGrHist* III C, p. 758, who edited the present fragment under the booktitle *Περὶ Ἐμπεδόκλεους*, as if this was X.'s third work in addition to the *Λυδιακά* and the *Μαγικά*. Mazzarino I (1966: 208) is of the opinion that X. dedicated a long monograph to Empedokles, or at least a considerable digression that was considered to be a monograph; cf. Momigliano (1971: 31). Brown (1988: 27) sees no reason why X. should not have written a work on Empedokles, although he admits that some scholars are reluctant to acknowledge such an independent work.

17 Cf. e.g. von Gutschmid (1893: 315); Nock (1972: 689) and Kingsley (1995: 183-185), who consider X.'s *Μαγικά* to be a part of his *Λυδιακά*.

18 For a survey of the political situation in Akragas in and around Empedokles' time, see e.g. de Waele (1971: 109-131); Maddoli (1980: 55-56); Wright (1981: 7-8) and Asheri (1990).

19 See de Waele (1971: 169-170), who mentions this as one possible hypothesis, and especially Chitwood (1986: 176), who considers the whole Empedokles-biography to be "the outcome of the tradition which transforms philosophy into biography through a biographical reading of the subject's work".

20 See Chitwood (1986: 177; 179). In her view the anecdote about the refusal of kingship might have been credible, had it not occurred in Diogenes' Herakleitos-vita as well (Diog. Laert. 9,6 = *FGrHist* 508 F 10; cf. *FGrHist* 1035). Chitwood is of the opinion that ancient biographers and historians told this kind of story in order to represent their philosophers as politically aware men with democratic aims; cf. already Bidez (1894: 131 n. 2).

Besides the present anecdote, there are in Diogenes' work many other traces of a tradition about Empedokles acting against tyranny and oligarchy[21], and hence several scholars accept that he may have declined a throne as well[22]. However, the democratic tendency attributed to Empedokles seems to contradict the megalomanic attitude he is said to have adopted in his poetry[23] and his way of dressing[24]. Whether this contradiction was noticed already by Timaios—as many scholars assume—depends on the emendation of Diog. Laert. 8,66[25]. However, Aristotle's hesitation concerning Empedokles' denial of kingship (εἴ γε...) might support the supposition that the debate already started in antiquity. Vattuone[26] maintained that Timaios'

---

[21] Diog. Laert. 8,64: Timaios gives the reason why Empedokles was a democrat: once, he was invited to a dinner by one of the archons, who did not want to serve any wine until the servant of the senate had arrived. Upon his arrival the servant was nominated symposiarch and all of the guests were obliged to drink wine or have it poured over their heads. That evening Empedokles kept quiet, but the next day he accused the magistrate and the servant (probably of tyrannical intentions) and had them both sentenced to death; Diog. Laert. 8,65: When the doctor Akron asked the council for a suitable place to build a monument for his father, Empedokles opposed him in a speech περὶ ἰσότητος; Diog. Laert. 8,66: Empedokles broke up the Assembly of the Thousand, an oligarchical regime which had been established for three years; Diog. Laert. 8,72: Neanthes of Kyzikos relates that after the death of Empedokles' father Meton, when tyranny was threatening again, Empedokles persuaded the Agrigentines to put an end to their rivalries and to practice political equality.

[22] See e.g. Wellmann (1905: 2507); Millerd (1908: 5-6); Burnet (1930[4]: 198-199); Guthrie (1965: 131); Lambridis (1976: 10-13); Vattuone (1991: 118-119) and Centrone (1992: 4207-4208).

[23] Cf. Diog. Laert. 8,62 and 8,66: Empedokles boasts of his immortality.

[24] Cf. Diog. Laert. 8,73: Empedokles wore a purple robe with a golden girdle, slippers of bronze and a Delphic laurel-wreath. According to Wright (1981: 8 n. 33) these details about Empedokles' dress might be a later elaboration.

[25] After relating the anecdote about Empedokles breaking up the Assemby of the Thousand, Diogenes states that this not only proves that Empdokles was a wealthy man, but also that he favoured the people's cause. Then the text continues: ὅ γέ τοι Τίμαιος (...) ἐναντίαν ἐσχηκέναι γνώμην αὐτὸν τῇ πολιτείᾳ φαίνεσθαι, which corresponds to the preceding phrase, but raises some difficulties in regard to what follows. Diels' conjecture αὐτὸν <ἔν> τε τῇ πολιτείᾳ <καὶ ἐν τῇ ποιήσει (…)> φαίνεσθαι, which Hicks II (1925: 381) translates: "he seems to have held opposite views when in public life and when writing poetry," fits in very well with the next sentence, the quotation of a verse in which Empedokles declares himself to be an immortal god (cf. n. 23). Although he admits that the text is corrupt, Asheri (1990: 497-498) does not agree with this and other proposed restorations of the passus. He holds that such emendations lack any documentary value and reflect only the opinion of the scholar who advances them. He therefore insists on taking into account only legible words in the text, which do not allow him to say more than that Empedokles seems to have had ideas contrary to those of the political regime in vigour at the time.

[26] Vattuone (1991: 115-117).

account of Empedokles' concrete political actions was meant to counteract the megalomanic image that resulted from certain parts of the poet's work. That even today some scholars are tempted to give credit to these boastful verses and to the anecdotes about Empedokles' extravagant dress and manner is proved by the examples of Andò[27] and Asheri[28], who both conclude that Empedokles was not a democrat at all[29]. The latter[30] does not believe that Empedokles refused a kingship, but assumes that he fell victim to the suspicions of his political enemies and was banished after some sort of trial[31].

Though it is impossible to draw a clear line between fact and fiction in the reports about Empedokles, it seems commendable to conclude with Wright[32] and Kirk – Raven – Schofield[33] that the anecdotes about his political life may contain some historical kernel. It is anything but surprising that Empedokles should have played some part in the affairs of his city, as he was wealthy[34], came from a prominent family[35], and was associated with the origins of rhetoric[36]. He may

---

27 Andò (1982/3: 47-48).

28 Asheri (1990: 499 with n. 44).

29 Asheri (1990: 498-499) even considers the dissolution of the Thousand—of which Empedokles would have been a member himself—to be an anti-democratic measure. He is of the opinion that there never was a democratic assembly in Akragas. The dissolution of the Thousand would have meant a return to the previous oligarchic regime, after a period of timocracy during which the equestrian class had access to the βουλή.

30 Asheri (1990: 493-494).

31 Cf. Diog. Laert. 8,67. But there it is said that the *descendants* of his enemies banished Empedokles.

32 See Wright (1981: 7-9).

33 See Kirk – Raven – Schofield (1983^2: 281-282).

34 That Empedokles was rich, can be gathered e.g. from Diog. Laert. 8, 66: οὐ μόνον ἦν τῶν πλουσίων and 8,73: he paid dowries for many poor girls in his city.

35 On Empedokles' family, see Diog. Laert. 8,51-54: according to Timaios and Hermippos, his grandfather Empedokles was a man of distinction; Herakleides states that Empedokles was descended from an illustrious family, as his grandfather kept horses; Eratosthenes, on the authority of Aristotle, and Apollodoros record that his grandfather was victorious in the 71st Olympiad. Empedokles' alleged opposition to tyranny and oligarchy are not necessarily incompatible with his aristocratic background since these political systems often harmed old aristocratic families; cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1929: 653 = 1935: 510).

36 See Diog. Laert. 8,57 and 9,25: Aristotle states that Empedokles was the inventor of rhetoric (cf. n. 14); Diog. Laert. 8,58: Aristotle relates that Empedokles wrote political discourses and Satyros says he was an excellent orator, Gorgias being one of his pupils.

even have declined a kingship, although the exact character of this βασιλεία then becomes a matter of speculation[37].
However, the notion that he refused such a dignity out of love for frugality seems altogether less likely, since Empedokles lived anything but a modest life[38]. As we have surmised above, the detail about a frugal life may have been concocted by a later biographical source and bear little or no relation to historical fact. If Empedokles declined 'a crown', he may have done so for very different reasons. Perhaps he acted in the name of democracy[39], but several other motives are also possible. Grottanelli[40], for example, followed by Kingsley[41], makes a case for interpreting Empedokles' refusal of kingship within the context of Eastern Mediterranean healers and saviours[42], a typical characteristic of whom seems to have been their unwillingness to transform their charisma into actual power. It may be concluded that a definitive answer to all of the historical questions raised by the fragment under discussion seems beyond reach and that we may perhaps have to accept that Empedokles' exact political attitude remains hidden behind the legend of his life.

Guido Schepens – Els Theys

---

[37] Brown (1988: 27) suggests it may have been a magistracy like that of the King Archon in Athens or a hereditary kingship, perhaps a priesthood; Asheri (1990: 494) thinks of an elective αἰσυμνητεία; cf. already de Waele (1971: 170), who mentions this as one of several possibilities. Maybe Empedokles was offered a kingship in reward for the benefits he had rendered to the city; for other examples of such a procedure, see Barceló (1993: 238-239). On different forms of βασιλεία, see e.g. Carlier (1984: 487-491) and Barceló (1993: 203-245).

[38] Cf. Lambridis (1976: 12).

[39] Cf. Vattuone (1991: 119), who holds that Timaios wanted to correct the statement about a frugal life by relating the anecdote about the symposium (Diog. Laert. 8,64 = *FGrHist* 566 F 134; cf. n. 21). However, since Timaios' account is introduced as a confirmation (Τὰ δ' αὐτὰ καὶ Τίμαιος εἴρηκε), it seems more likely that he wanted to express his agreement with Aristotle's assertion that Empedokles was ἐλεύθερον καὶ πάσης ἀρχῆς ἀλλότριον.

[40] See Grottanelli (1982: 660-662).

[41] See Kingsley (1995: 186-187).

[42] Empedokles was also known as a miracle-worker, cf. Diog. Laert. 8,60-61; 67; 69 and 70; Porph., *Vita Pyth.*, 29; Iambl., *Vita Pyth.*, 135; see also *Suda* E 1002-1003 *s.v.* Ἐμπεδοκλῆς. Empedokles' oriental background has been emphasized by several scholars; for references, see Kingsley (1995: 187 n. 91).

Text editions and translations

E. Bignone, *I poeti filosofi della Grecia. Empedocle. Studio critico. Traduzione e commento delle testimonianze e dei frammenti* (Il pensiero greco 11), Torino - Milano - Roma 1916 (= Roma 1963).
F. Creuzer, *Historicorum Graecorum antiquissimorum fragmenta*, Heidelberg - London - Paris - Amsterdam 1806, p. 135-232.
H. Diels – W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Dublin - Zürich 1951[6] (= 1966).
M. Gigante, *Frammenti di Ippoboto. Contributo alla storia della storiografia filosofica*, in A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves*, Padova 1983, p. 151-193.
O. Gigon, *Aristotelis Opera*, III. *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, Berlin - New York 1987.
R.D. Hicks, Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, II, London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1925.
G.S. Kirk – J.E. Raven – M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge - London - New York - New Rochelle - Melbourne - Sydney 1983[2].
* H.S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* II (Sciptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964 (= 1966).
V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1886 (= Stuttgart 1967).
W.D. Ross, *Aristotelis fragmenta selecta* (Sciptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1955 (= 1958, 1964, 1970).
M.R. Wright, *Empedocles: the Extant Fragments. Edited, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Concordance*, New Haven - London 1981.

Secondary literature

V. Andò, *Nestis o l'elemento acqua in Empedocle*, in *Κώκαλος* 28-29 (1982-1983), p. 31-51.
D. Asheri, *Agrigento libera: rivolgimenti interni e problemi costituzionali,* ca. *471-446 a.C.*, in *Athenaeum* 88 (1990), p. 483-501.
P. Barceló, *Basileia, Monarchia, Tyrannis. Untersuchungen zu Entwicklung und Beurteilung von Alleinherrschaft im vorhellenistischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 1993.
J. Bidez, *La biographie d'Empédocle*, Gent 1894 (= Hildesheim - New York 1973).
J. Bidez – F. Cumont, *Les mages hellenisés. Zoroastre, Ostranès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque* I-II, Paris 1938.
T.S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenion*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1958.
T.S. Brown, *The Greek Exiles: Herodotus' Contemporaries*, in *AncW* 17 (1988), p. 17-28.
J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, London 1930[4] (= 1948).
P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg 1984.
B. Centrone, *L'VIII libro delle 'Vite' di Diogene Laerzio*, in *ANRW* II 36,6, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 4183-4217.
A. Chitwood, *The Death of Empedocles*, in *AJPh* 107 (1986), p. 175-191.

J.A. de Waele, *Acragas Graeca. Die historische Topographie des griechischen Akragas auf Sizilien*, I. *Historischer Teil*, 's-Gravenhage 1971.
R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1973.
R.L. Fowler, *Herodotos and his Contemporaries*, in *JHS* 116 (1996), p. 62-87.
C. Grottanelli, *Healers and Saviours of the Eastern Mediterranean in Pre-Classical Times*, in U. Bianchi – M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero romano. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale su -, Roma 24-28 settembre 1979*, Leiden 1982, p. 649-670.
W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, II. *The Pre-Socratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*, Cambridge 1965.
H. Herter, art. *Xanthos* (25), in *RE* 9A,2 (1967), col. 1353-1374.
P. Kingsley, *Meetings with Magi: Iranian Themes among the Greeks, from Xanthus of Lydia to Plato's Academy*, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, S. III 5 (1995), p. 173-209.
H. Lambridis, *Empedokles: a philosophical investigation. With a prefatory essay* Empedokles and T.S. Eliot *by M. McLuhan*, Alabama 1976.
G. Maddoli, *Il VI e il V secolo a.C.*, in E. Gabba – G. Vallet (ed.), *La Sicilia antica*, II 1. *La Sicilia greca dal VI secolo alle guerre puniche*, [Napoli] 1980, p. 1-102.
S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I, Bari 1966.
K. Meister, *Stesimbrotos' Schrift über die athenischen Staatsmänner und ihre historische Bedeutung (FGrHist 107 F 1-11)*, in *Historia* 27 (1978), p. 274-294.
J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978.
C.E. Millerd, *On the Interpretation of Empedocles*, Diss. Chicago 1908 (= New York - London 1980).
A.D. Nock, *The Problem of Zoroaster*, in *AJA* 53 (1949), p. 272-285 (= Id., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World. Selected and edited with an Introduction, Bibliography of Nock's writings, and Indexes, by Z. Stewart*, Oxford 1972, II, p. 682-702).
L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, Oxford 1939.
L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and His Predecessors*, Atlanta 1987.
G. Schepens, *Jacoby's FGrHist: Problems, Methods, Prospects*, in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen 1997, p. 144-172.
P. Tozzi, *Xanto di Lidia*, in *RIL* 99 (1965), p. 175-184.
R. Vattuone, *Sapienza d'occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio*, Bologna 1991.
A. von Gutschmid, *Aus Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der griechischen Historiographie*, in Id., *Kleine Schriften*, IV. *Schriften zur griechischen Geschichte und Literatur*, Leipzig 1893, p. 279-335 (esp. p. 307-315).
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die* Καθαρμοί *des Empedokles*, in *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 27 (1929), p. 626-661 (= Id., *Kleine Schriften* I, Berlin 1935, p. 473-521).
F.G. Welcker, *Kleine Schriften* I, Bonn 1844, p. 431-450.
E. Wellmann, art. *Empedokles* (3), in *RE* 5,2 (1905), col. 2507-2512.
K. Ziegler, art. *Xanthos* (29), in *RE* 9A,2 (1967), col. 1374.

1002 (= 107). Stesimbrotos of Thasos
(c. 470–425 B.C.)

T

1 Plut. *Cim.* 4,5: Στησίμβροτος δ' ὁ Θάσιος περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμοῦ τι χρόνον τῷ Κίμωνι γεγονώς (*cf.* F 4).

2 Athen. 13,56 p. 589d: Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος ἱστορεῖ, κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αὐτῷ (*sc.* Περικλεῖ) χρόνους γενόμενος καὶ ἑωρακὼς αὐτόν, ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους (*cf.* F 10a).

3 Plat. *Ion* 530c-d: οἶμαι κάλλιστα ἀνθρώπων λέγειν περὶ Ὁμήρου, ὡς οὔτε Μητρόδωρος ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς οὔτε Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος οὔτε Γλαύκων (*FGrHist* IV B) οὔτε ἄλλος οὐδεὶς τῶν πώποτε γενομένων ἔσχεν εἰπεῖν οὕτω πολλὰς καὶ καλὰς διανοίας περὶ Ὁμήρου ὅσας ἐγώ.

4 Xen. *Symp.* 3,6: οἶσθά τι οὖν ἔθνος ... ἠλιθιώτερον ῥαψῳδῶν; ... σὺ δὲ (*sc.* Νικήρατε) Στησιμβρότῳ τε καὶ Ἀναξιμάνδρῳ (*FGrHist* 9 T 3) καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς πολὺ δέδωκας ἀργύριον, ὥστε οὐδέν σε τῶν πολλοῦ ἀξίων λέληθε.

5 *Suda* A 2681 *s.v.* Ἀντίμαχος Κολοφώνιος· ... τινὲς δὲ καὶ οἰκέτην αὐτὸν ἀνέγραψαν Πανυάσιδος τοῦ ποιητοῦ, πάνυ ψευσάμενοι. ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἀκουστὴς καὶ Στησιμβρότου.

F

1. ΠΕΡΙ ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΘΟΥΚΥΔΙΔΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΕΡΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ (F 1-11)

1 (= *FHG* II p. 52 F 1) Plut. *Them.* 2,5-6: Καίτοι Στησίμβροτος Ἀναξαγόρου τε διακοῦσαι τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα φησὶ καὶ περὶ Μέλισσον σπουδάσαι τὸν φυσικόν, οὐκ εὖ τῶν χρόνων ἁπτόμενος· Περικλεῖ γάρ, ὃς πολὺ νεώτερος ἦν Θεμιστοκλέους, Μέλισσος μὲν ἀντεστρατήγει πολιορκοῦντι Σαμίους, Ἀναξαγόρας δὲ συνδιέτριβε. Μᾶλλον οὖν ἄν τις προσέχοι τοῖς Μνησιφίλου τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα τοῦ Φρεαρρίου ζηλωτὴν γενέσθαι λέγουσιν κτλ.

---

8 Γλαύκων *codd.* : Γλαῦκος *Sydenham*

1002 (= 107). Stesimbrotos of Thasos
(c. 470–425 B.C.)

T

1 Stesimbrotos of Thasos, a close contemporary of Kimon's.

2 As recorded by Stesimbrotos of Thasos, a contemporary of his (*sc.* Perikles) who had seen him, in his book entitled *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles.*

3 In my opinion I am the best speaker of all men on Homer, and neither Metrodoros of Lampsakos, nor Stesimbrotos of Thasos nor Glaukon or anybody else, who has ever lived, could express so many and such beautiful thoughts on Homer as I can.

4 Do you know a more foolish kind of people than the reciters of epic poems? ... But you (*sc.* Nikeratos) gave Stesimbrotos and Anaximandros and many others much money with the intention, that nothing of great value should escape your notice.

5 Antimachos: A man from Kolophon ... some authors—completely mistaken in their opinion—wrote that he was a servant of Panyasis the poet; for he was his and Stesimbrotos' disciple.

F

1. ON THEMISTOKLES, THUKYDIDES AND PERIKLES

1 In spite of this Stesimbrotos asserts that Themistokles was a pupil of Anaxagoras and attended the lectures of Melissos the physicist. But here he is obviously mistaken in his dates, for when Perikles, who was much younger than Themistokles, was besieging Samos, Melissos was the general who opposed him, while Anaxagoras was one of Perikles' intimate friends. For this reason it is easier to believe those writers who say that Themistokles was an admirer of Mnesiphilos, a member of the same deme of Phrearrus.

2 (*FHG* -) Plut. *Them.* 4,4-5: Ἐκ δὲ τούτου κατὰ μικρὸν ὑπάγων καὶ καταβιβάζων τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν, ὡς τὰ πεζὰ μὲν οὐδὲ τοῖς ὁμόροις ἀξιομάχους ὄντας, τῇ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν ἀλκῇ καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀμύνασθαι καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄρχειν δυναμένους, ἀντὶ μονίμων ὁπλιτῶν, ὥς φησιν ὁ Πλάτων (Plat. *Leg.* 706c), ναυβάτας καὶ θαλασσίους ἐποίησε, καὶ διαβολὴν καθ' ἑαυτοῦ παρέσχεν, ὡς ἄρα Θεμιστοκλῆς τὸ δόρυ καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα τῶν πολιτῶν παρελόμενος εἰς ὑπηρέσιον καὶ κώπην συνέστειλε τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον. Ἔπραξε δὲ ταῦτα Μιλτιάδου κρατήσας ἀντιλέγοντος, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Στησίμβροτος.

3 (= *FHG* F 2) Plut. *Them.* 24,6-25,1: Ἐκεῖ δ' αὐτῷ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ἐκκλέψας ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν Ἐπικράτης ὁ Ἀχαρνεὺς ἀπέστειλεν· ὃν ἐπὶ τούτῳ Κίμων ὕστερον κρίνας ἐθανάτωσεν, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Στησίμβροτος. Εἶτ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐπιλαθόμενος τούτων ἢ τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα ποιῶν ἐπιλαθόμενον, πλεῦσαί φησιν εἰς Σικελίαν καὶ παρ' Ἱέρωνος αἰτεῖν τοῦ τυράννου τὴν θυγατέρα πρὸς γάμον, ὑπισχνούμενον αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ὑπηκόους ποιήσειν· ἀποτριψαμένου δὲ τοῦ Ἱέρωνος οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀπᾶραι. Ταῦτα δ' οὐκ εἰκός ἐστιν οὕτω γενέσθαι.

4 (= *FHG* F 3) Plut. *Cim.* 4,4-8: Μιλτιάδης μὲν οὖν πεντήκοντα ταλάντων ὀφλὼν δίκην καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἔκτισιν εἱρχθείς, ἐτελεύτησεν ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ, Κίμων δὲ μειράκιον παντάπασιν ἀπολειφθεὶς μετὰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἔτι κόρης οὔσης καὶ ἀγάμου, τὸν πρῶτον ἠδόξει χρόνον ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ κακῶς ἤκουεν ὡς ἄτακτος καὶ πολυπότης καὶ τῷ παππῷ Κίμωνι προσεοικὼς τὴν φύσιν, ὅν δι' εὐήθειάν φασι Κοάλεμον προσαγορευθῆναι. Στησίμβροτος δ' ὁ Θάσιος, περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμοῦ τι χρόνον τῷ Κίμωνι γεγονώς, φησὶν αὐτὸν οὔτε μουσικὴν οὔτ' ἄλλο τι μάθημα τῶν ἐλευθερίων καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐπιχωριαζόντων ἐκδιδαχθῆναι, δεινότητός τε καὶ στωμυλίας Ἀττικῆς ὅλως ἀπηλλάχθαι, καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ πολὺ τὸ γενναῖον καὶ ἀληθὲς ἐνυπάρχειν, καὶ μᾶλλον εἶναι Πελοποννήσιον τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ ἀνδρός,

φαῦλον, ἄκομψον, τὰ μέγιστ' ἀγαθόν,

κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδειον Ἡρακλέα (Eurip. *Licymn.* F 473 Nauck). Ταῦτα γὰρ ἔστι τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Στησιμβρότου γεγραμμένοις ἐπειπεῖν. Ἔτι δὲ νέος ὢν αἰτίαν ἔσχε πλησιάζειν τῇ

---

24 καταβιάζων *Υ* **24** θάλασσαν *Υ* **25** ὁμόροις *Bryan* : ὁμοίοις **26** ἀμύνεσθαι *Υ* **27** ὁ *om. Υ* **27** ναυβάτας *S et e corr. m. 1 A* : ναβάτας *Υ* **27** θαλαττίους *Υ* **28** καθ' αὑτοῦ *A* **29** ὑπηρέσιον *AM* : ὑπειρέσιον *SU* **29** τὸν *S* : τὸν τῶν *Υ* **33** ἀθηναίων *Υ* **37** ὑπισχνούμενος *U* **38** ἀποτρεψαμένου *Υ* : ἀποτριψαμένου *S*

2 After this he continued to work on the Athenians little by little and turn their thoughts in the direction of the sea. He told them that their army was no match even for their nearest neighbours, the Boeotians, but that with the power they would command in their fleet they could not only drive off the barbarians, but become the leaders of all Greece. He turned them, to use Plato's phrase, from steadfast hoplites into sea-tossed mariners, and he earned for himself the charge that he had deprived the Athenians of the spear and the shield and degraded them to the rowing bench and the oar. What is more he succeeded, as Stesimbrotos tells us, in forcing through this policy in spite of the opposition of Miltiades.

3 Epikrates of Acharnai smuggled Themistokles' wife and children out of Athens to join him in Epeiros, and for this action, according to Stesimbrotos, he was afterwards prosecuted by Kimon and put to death. But a little later Stesimbrotos in some way or other either forgets this episode himself or makes Themistokles forget it, and tells us that he sailed to Sicily and asked for the hand of the daughter of the tyrant Hieron, promising to make the Greeks subject to him, but that Hieron refused him and so he then sailed for Asia. This account seems unlikely.

4 Miltiades had been condemned by the Athenians to pay a fine of fifty talents. He was thrown into prison until he could find the money, and there he died. Kimon, who was scarcely more than a boy, was thus left with his sister, who was also young and unmarried. For some time his career was entirely undistinguished, except that he earned a bad name for disorderly behaviour, heavy drinking, and in general for taking after his grandfather, Kimon, who was said to have been so stupid that he was nicknamed Koalemos, or *The Booby*. Stesimbrotos of Thasos, who was a near contemporary of Kimon's, says that he never acquired a literary education or any other of the liberal accomplishments which a Greek normally possessed, and that he was without a spark of true Attic cleverness and eloquence; on the other hand he adds that his manner gave an impression of great nobility and candour and that the spirit of the man seemed altogether more Peloponnesian (*sc.* than Athenian).

His nature was unadorned / forthright and at its best in times of crisis,

as Euripides wrote of Herakles, and we may add this judgement to the character Stesimbrotos has given Kimon. While he was still a young man, he was accused of

ἀδελφῇ· καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλως τὴν Ἐλπινίκην εὔτακτόν τινα γεγονέναι λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς Πολύγνωτον ἐξαμαρτεῖν τὸν ζῳγράφον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτό φασιν ἐν τῇ Πεισιανακτείῳ τότε καλουμένῃ (Ποικίλῃ δὲ νῦν) στοᾷ γράφοντα τὰς Τρῳάδας τὸ τῆς Λαοδίκης ποιῆσαι πρόσωπον ἐν εἰκόνι τῆς Ἐλπινίκης. Ὁ δὲ Πολύγνωτος οὐκ ἦν τῶν βαναύσων, οὐδ' ἀπ' ἐργολαβίας ἔγραφε τὴν στοάν, ἀλλὰ προῖκα, φιλοτιμούμενος πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, ὡς οἵ τε συγγραφεῖς ἱστοροῦσι καὶ Μελάνθιος ὁ ποιητὴς (F. 1 Diehl = vol. II[2] p. 82 F 1 West) λέγει τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον·

αὑτοῦ γὰρ δαπάναισι θεῶν ναοὺς ἀγοράν τε
Κεκροπίαν κόσμης' ἡμιθέων ἀρεταῖς.

Εἰσὶ δ' οἳ τὴν Ἐλπινίκην οὐ κρύφα τῷ Κίμωνι, φανερῶς δὲ γημαμέμην συνοικῆσαι λέγουσιν, ἀξίου τῆς εὐγενείας νυμφίου διὰ τὴν πενίαν ἀποροῦσαν· κτλ.

5 (= *FHG* F 4) Plut. *Cim.* 14,3-5: Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ῥᾳδίως ἐπιβῆναι Μακεδονίας καὶ πολλὴν ἀποτεμέσθαι παρασχὸν ὡς ἐδόκει, μὴ θελήσας αἰτίαν ἔσχε δώροις ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου συμπεπεῖσθαι, καὶ δίκην ἔφυγε τῶν ἐχθρῶν συστάντων ἐπ' αὐτόν. Ἀπολογούμενος δὲ πρὸς τοὺς δικαστάς, οὐκ Ἰώνων ἔφη προξενεῖν οὐδὲ Θεσσαλῶν πλουσίων ὄντων ὥσπερ ἑτέρους, ἵνα θεραπεύωνται καὶ λαμβάνωσιν, ἀλλὰ Λακεδαιμονίων, μιμούμενος καὶ ἀγαπῶν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐτέλειαν καὶ σωφροσύνην, ἧς οὐδένα προτιμᾶν πλοῦτον, ἀλλὰ πλουτίζων ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων τὴν πόλιν ἀγάλλεσθαι. Μνησθεὶς δὲ τῆς κρίσεως ἐκείνης ὁ Στησίμβροτός φησι τὴν Ἐλπινίκην ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κίμωνος δεομένην ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ Περικλέους - οὗτος γὰρ ἦν τῶν κατηγόρων ὁ σφοδρότατος -, τὸν δὲ μειδιάσαντα "γραῦς εἶ" φάναι "γραῦς, ὦ Ἐλπινίκη, ὡς τηλικαῦτα διαπράττεσθαι πράγματα"· πλὴν ἔν γε τῇ δίκῃ πρᾳότατον γενέσθαι τῷ Κίμωνι καὶ πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν ἅπαξ ἀνασθῆναι μόνον ὥσπερ ἀφοσιούμενον.

6 (= *FHG* F 5) Plut. *Cim.* 16,1-2: Ἦν μὲν οὖν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς φιλολάκων, καὶ τῶν γε παίδων τῶν διδύμων τὸν ἕτερον Λακεδαιμόνιον ὠνόμασε, τὸν δ' ἕτερον Ἠλεῖον, ἐκ γυναικὸς αὐτῷ Κλειτορίας γενομένους, ὡς Στησίμβροτος ἱστορεῖ· διὸ πολλάκις Περικλέα τὸ μητρῷον αὐτοῖς γένος ὀνειδίζειν. Διόδωρος δ' ὁ περιηγητὴς (*FGrHist* 372 F 37) καὶ τούτους φησὶ καὶ τὸν

56 πλεισιανακτίῳ *S* : πλησιανακτίω *Υ* : *em. Xylander (cf. Diog. Laert. 7,1,6; Suda s.v.)* **63** ἀρεταῖς *Reiske* : ἀγοραῖσιν **67** παρασχὸν, ο *e corr.* *S* : παρασχὼν *Υ* **68** συμπεπεῖσθαι *A* : συμπεσεῖσθαι *SU* **72** Λακεδαιμονίων *Muret* : λακεδονίους / λακεδαιμίους *(m. 2) A* μακεδονίους *SU* **83** Ἠλεῖον *immo* Οὔλιον (*cf. Kirchner PA 11496 et add*) **83** κλιτορίας : *em. Corais* **84** τὸν περικλέα *Υ*

having committed incest with his sister. Indeed, Elpinike is said to have been careless of her virtue on other occasions, too, and to have been the mistress of Polygnotos the painter. This is the origin of the story that when he was painting the *Trojan women* in what was then called the *Peisianakteion*, but is now the *Stoa Poikile*, he introduced Elpinike's features into the portrait of Laodike. Polygnotos was far from being a mere craftsman and he did not make a contract to decorate the *Colonnade*, but undertook the work for nothing simply out of the desire to honour his city. We learn this from the historians and from the poet Melanthios, who wrote:

"He at his own expense adorned the Cecropian market and the god's temples:
his theme told of the heroes' great deeds".

Others have said that there was nothing clandestine about Elpinike's relations with Kimon, but that she lived quite openly with him as his wife, because she was too poor to find a husband worthy of her noble birth.

5 From this base he might easily, so the Athenians considered, have invaded Macedonia and seized possession of a large part of its territory. But because he had no wish to do this, he was accused of having been bought off by King Alexander, and his enemies combined to impeach him. In his defence at the trial he told the judges that he was not, like some Athenians, the paid representative (*proxenos*) of rich Ionians or Thessalians, to be courted or rewarded for his services, but rather of Lacedaemonians, whose simplicity and moderation he was glad to imitate. He added that he preferred these qualities to any amount of riches, but took pride in enriching his own city with the spoils he won from her enemies. In mentioning this trial Stesimbrotos says that Elpinike came to Perikles' house to plead with him for her brother, since he was the most determined of Kimon's accusers, and he adds that Perikles smiled and said: "You are long past the age, Elpinike, for taking a hand in affairs like this". However, at the trial he proved the mildest of Kimon's prosecutors and rose only once to press the charges against him, as though his doing so were a mere formality.

6 It is certainly true that from the very beginning of his career he was sympathetic to the Spartans. He actually named one of his three sons Lakedaimonios and another Eleios. These were the children whom a woman of Kleitor bore him, as Stesimbrotos tells us, and for this reason Perikles often reproached them with their descent on their mother's side. However, Diodoros the topographer maintains that these two, as well as Kimon's

τρίτον τῶν Κίμωνος υἱῶν Θεσσαλὸν ἐξ Ἰσοδίκης γεγονέναι τῆς Εὐρυπτολέμου τοῦ Μεγακλέους.

7 (= *FHG* F 6) Plut. *Cim* 16,3: Ἔπειτα δυνατώτεροι γενόμενοι καὶ τὸν Κίμωνα τοῖς Σπαρτιάταις οὐκ ἠρέμα προσκείμενον ὁρῶντες ἤχθοντο. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ παντὶ μεγαλύνων τὴν Λακεδαίμονα πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, καὶ μάλιστα ὅτε τύχοι μεμφόμενος αὐτοῖς ἢ παροξύνων, ὥς φήσι Στησίμβροτος, εἰώθει λέγειν· "ἀλλ' οὐ Λακεδαιμόνιοί γε τοιοῦτοι". Ὅθεν φθόνον ἑαυτῷ συνῆγε καὶ δυσμένειάν τινα παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν.

8 (= *FHG* F 7) Plut. *Per.* 26,1: Ἐπεὶ δὲ μείζων ἕτερος στόλος ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν καὶ παντελῶς κατεκλείσθησαν οἱ Σάμιοι, λαβὼν ὁ Περικλῆς ἑξήκοντα τριήρεις ἔπλευσεν εἰς τὸν ἔξω πόντον, ὡς μὲν οἱ πλεῖστοι λέγουσι, Φοινισσῶν νεῶν ἐπικούρων τοῖς Σαμίοις προσφερομένων, ἀπαντῆσαι καὶ διαγωνίσασθαι πορρωτάτω βουλόμενος, ὡς δὲ Στησίμβροτος, ἐπὶ Κύπρον στελλόμενος· ὅπερ οὐ δοκεῖ πιθανὸν εἶναι.

9 (= *FHG* F 8) Plut. *Per.* 8,9: Ὁ δὲ Στησίμβροτός φησιν, ὅτι τοὺς ἐν Σάμῳ τεθνηκότας ἐγκωμιάζων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀθανάτους ἔλεγε γεγονέναι καθάπερ τοὺς θεούς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους αὐτοὺς ὁρῶμεν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τιμαῖς ἃς ἔχουσι καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἃ παρέχουσιν ἀθανάτους εἶναι τεκμαιρόμεθα· ταὔτ' οὖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθανοῦσιν.

10a (= *FHG* F 10) Athen. 13,56 p. 589d/e: Ἦν δ' οὗτος <ὁ> ἀνὴρ πρὸς ἀφροδίσια πάνυ καταφερής· ὅστις καὶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ γυναικὶ συνῆν, ὡς Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος ἱστορεῖ, κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αὐτῷ χρόνους γενόμενος καὶ ἑωρακὼς αὐτόν, ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους.

10b (= *FHG* F 9) Plut. *Per.* 13,15-16: Δεξάμενοι δὲ τὸν λόγον οἱ κωμικοὶ (Adesp. F 702 Kassel – Austin) πολλὴν ἀσέλγειαν αὐτοῦ κατεσκέδασαν, εἴς τε τὴν Μενίππου γυναῖκα διαβάλλοντες, ἀνδρὸς φίλου καὶ ὑποστρατηγοῦντος, εἴς τε τὰς Πυριλάμπους ὀρνιθοτροφίας, ὅς ἑταῖρος ὢν Περικλέους αἰτίαν εἶχε ταῶνας ὑφιέναι ταῖς γυναιξὶν αἷς ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπλησίαζε. Καὶ τί ἄν τις ἀνθρώπους σατυρικοὺς τοῖς βίοις καὶ τὰς κατὰ τῶν κρειττόνων βλασφημίας ὥσπερ δαίμονι κακῷ τῷ φθόνῳ τῶν πολλῶν ἀποθύοντας ἑκάστοτε θαυμάσειεν, ὅπου καὶ Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος δεινὸν ἀσέβημα καὶ μυσῶδες

---

90 τὴν *S* : τὸν *Υ* **102** οὐδὲ *S* : οὐ *Υ* **104** ἃ παρέχουσιν *Bryan* : ἅπερ ἔχουσιν *codd.* **104** ἀθανάτους *del. Sauppe* **104** ταὔτ' *Corais* : ταῦτ' *libri, quod tuetur Schaefer* **106** ὁ *add. Kaibel* **112** ἀσέλγεια *U*[1] **113** συστρατηγοῦντος *Cobet* **117** μυθῶδες *em. Cobet*

third son, Thessalos, were born to Isodike, the daughter of Euryptolemos and granddaughter of Megakles.

7 But afterwards, when their power had grown and they saw that Kimon was wholeheartedly attached to the Spartans, they resented this, not least because of his tendency to sing the praises of Sparta to the Athenians whenever he had occasion to reproach them or spur them on. At such moments, so Stesimbrotos tells us, he would say: "But the Lacedaemonians are not that kind of people". This habit alone created a great deal of jealousy and dislike of him among the Athenians.

8 But soon a second and larger fleet arrived from Athens and the islanders were then completely blockaded. At this point Perikles took sixty triremes and sailed out into the open sea: most authorities agree that his object was to intercept a fleet of Phoenician ships on their way to help the Samians, and to engage them as far away from the island as possible. According to Stesimbrotos, however, his intention was to attack Cyprus, but this seems extremely unlikely.

9 Stesimbrotos also records that in his Funeral oration for those who had fallen in the war against Samos, Perikles declared that these men had become immortal like the gods: "for we cannot see the gods", he said, "but we believe them to be immortal from the honours we pay them and the blessings we receive from them, and so it is with those who have given their lives for their country".

10a He was a man in fact very prone to love affairs. He even consorted with his son's wife, as recorded by Stesimbrotos of Thasos, a contemporary of Perikles, who had seen him, in his book entitled *On Themistokles, Thukydides, and Perikles*.

10b The comic poets took up this story and showered Perikles with all the innuendos they could invent, coupling his name with the wife of Menippos, a man who was his friend and had served as his second-in-command in the army. Even Pyrilampes' fondness for keeping birds was dragged in, and because he was a friend of Perikles, he was accused of using his peacocks as presents for the women who granted Perikles their favours. The fact is that men who know nothing of decency in their own lives are only too ready to launch foul slanders against their betters and to offer them up as victims to the evil deity of popular envy. And, indeed, we can hardly be surprised at this, when we find that even Stesimbrotos of Thasos has dared to give

ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐτόλμησεν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ υἱοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Περικλέους; οὕτως ἔοικε πάντῃ χαλεπὸν εἶναι καὶ δυσθήρατον ἱστορίᾳ τἀληθές, ὅταν οἱ μὲν ὕστερον γεγονότες τὸν χρόνον ἔχωσιν ἐπιπροσθοῦντα τῇ γνώσει τῶν πραγμάτων, ἡ δὲ τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν βίων ἡλικιῶτις ἱστορία τὰ μὲν φθόνοις καὶ δυσμενείαις, τὰ δὲ χαριζομένη καὶ κολακεύουσα λυμαίνηται καὶ διαστρέφῃ τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

11 (= *FHG* F 11) Plut. *Per.* 36,1-6: Τὰ δ' οἰκεῖα μοχθηρῶς εἶχεν αὐτῷ, κατὰ τὸν λοιμὸν οὐκ ὀλίγους ἀποβαλόντι τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, καὶ στάσει διατεταραγμένα πόρρωθεν. Ὁ γὰρ πρεσβύτερος αὐτοῦ τῶν γνησίων υἱῶν Ξάνθιππος, φύσει τε δαπανηρὸς ὢν καὶ γυναικὶ νέᾳ καὶ πολυτελεῖ συνοικῶν, Τεισάνδρου θυγατρὶ τοῦ Ἐπιλύκου, χαλεπῶς ἔφερε τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκρίβειαν, γλίσχρα καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐτῷ χορηγοῦντος. Πέμψας οὖν πρός τινα τῶν φίλων ἔλαβεν ἀργύριον ὡς τοῦ Περικλέους κελεύσαντος. Ἐκείνου δ' ὕστερον ἀπαιτοῦντος, ὁ μὲν Περικλῆς καὶ δίκην αὐτῷ προσέλαχε, τὸ δὲ μειράκιον ὁ Ξάνθιππος ἐπὶ τούτῳ χαλεπῶς διατεθεὶς ἐλοιδόρει τὸν πατέρα, πρῶτον μὲν ἐκφέρων ἐπὶ γέλωτι τὰς οἴκοι διατριβὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς λόγους οὕς ἐποιεῖτο μετὰ τῶν σοφιστῶν. Πεντάθλου γάρ τινος ἀκοντίῳ πατάξαντος Ἐπίτιμον τὸν Φαρσάλιον ἀκουσίως καὶ κτείναντος, ἡμέραν ὅλην ἀναλῶσαι μετὰ Πρωταγόρου διαποροῦντα, πότερον τὸ ἀκόντιον ἢ τὸν βαλόντα μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς ἀγωνοθέτας κατὰ τὸν ὀρθότατον λόγον αἰτίους χρὴ τοῦ πάθους ἡγεῖσθαι. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ τὴν περὶ τῆς γυναικὸς διαβολὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ξανθίππου φησὶν ὁ Στησίμβροτος εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς διασπαρῆναι, καὶ ὅλως ἀνήκεστον ἄχρι τῆς τελευτῆς τῷ νεανίσκῳ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα διαμεῖναι τὴν διαφοράν· ἀπέθανε γὰρ ὁ Ξανθίππος ἐν τῷ λοιμῷ νοσήσας.

2. ΠΕΡΙ ΟΜΗΡΟΥ

cf. *FGrHist* IV B

---

120 ἐπιπροσθοῦντα *S* : ἐπίπροσθεν ὄντα *Υ* **123** κατά τε τὸν *Υ* **124** διατεταραγμένωι *S* διατεταραγμένων *Υ* : διατεταραγμένα *em. Sauppe* **125** πρεσβύτατος : *em. Blass* **126** οἰσανδρου *S* ἰσάνδρου *Υ*: *em. Sintenis* (*cf. Andok. 1,117; 3,29*) **127** γλίσχρως *C* **130** ὁ Ξάνθ. *del. Cobet* **131** ἐποίει *Υ* **132** τινος *S* : ἵππον *Υ* **132** ἐπιτιμίου τοῦ φαρσαλίου *Υ* **134** μᾶλλον *om. Υ* **135** ἡγεῖσθαι *Υ*: γενέσθαι *S*: *num* λέγεσθαι*? Fuhr* **138** παραμεῖναι *Υ*

currency to the shocking and completely unfounded charge that Perikles seduced his son's wife. This only goes to show how thickly the truth is hedged around with obstacles and how hard it is to track down by historical research. Writers who live after the events they describe find that their view of them is obscured by the lapse of time, while those who investigate the deeds and lives of their contemporaries are equally apt to corrupt and distort the truth, in some cases because of envy or private hatred, in others through the desire to flatter or show favour.

11 But his private affairs now caused him great distress. He had lost some of his closest friends in the plague and his affections had for some time past been torn by a family feud. Xanthippos, the eldest of his legitimate sons, was a spendthrift by nature, who had married a young and extravagant wife, the daughter of Teisander, Epilykos' son. Xanthippos resented his father's passion for economy and the meagre allowance he was given, and still more the fact that he only received it in small instalments. He therefore approached one of Perikles' friends and borrowed money from him, pretending that this was on Perikles' instructions. When the friend later asked for repayment, Perikles, so far from settling the debt, brought an action against him. Young Xanthippos was furious and began openly to abuse his father, telling stories to raise a laugh against him about his management of affairs at home and his conversations with sophists. For example, there was an athlete who had accidentally hit Epitimos the Pharsalian with a javelin and killed him, and Perikles wasted an entire day, according to Xanthippos, arguing with Protagoras as to whether, "in the strictest sense", it was the javelin, or the man who threw it, or the judges of the games, who should be held responsible for the accident. According to Stesimbrotos it was also Xanthippos who put about the scandalous story concerning his own wife's association with Perikles, and he says that to the very end of Xanthippos ' life the quarrel between him and his father was never made up, for the young man fell sick and died during the plague.

2. ON HOMER

(cf. IV B)

1002 (= 107). Stesimbrotos of Thasos
(c. 470–425 B.C.)

Introduction and commentary on T 1-5

In volume II B of *FGrHist* Jacoby collected the fragments of S.'s of Thasos work which has come down to us under the title *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*[1]. But Jacoby did not print exactly the same text as the later and currently still leading scholarly edition of Plutarch's lives of Kimon, Perikles and Themistokles by Ziegler in the Teubner series. In the following sample the Greek text and the *apparatus criticus* follow Ziegler (with modifications); hence there are some minor changes in the texts in comparison with Jacoby's edition, which is our justification for reprinting the Greek text of a work, the fragments of which have already been included in *FGrHist* 107 F 1-11. Other differences result from situating the relevant passages of some fragments from Plutarch's *Lives* in a larger context than Jacoby did or presenting the texts in another typographic form (that is in small, normal or expanded letters). The Greek text of the fragment from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai* is taken from Kaibel's[2] edition (with modifications) and does not differ from that of Jacoby. Since the time of Jacoby's collection no papyri containing new fragments from *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* have been found.

Jacoby's introduction to the life and works of S.[3] bear witness to his admirable talent for characterizing an author concisely. Jacoby's introduction and commentary and Laqueur's short article on S. in *RE*[4] still form the basis for the scholarly discussion on S.'s life and works and his place in the history of Greek literature. Hence a new commentary in the present collection requires some words of justification. The reader of the present collection should notice that remarks on the dates and facts of S.'s life and that commentaries on single fragments have been intentionally limited to basic facts. The main aim is to update Jacoby's commentary and to trace the course of the discussion in classical scholarship on S. and on the fifth-century roots of Greek historiography and biography as literary genres. Jacoby's own

---

[1] *FGrHist* 107 F 1-11 (1929 = 1962) with short commentaries on the fragments (II B, p. 345-349).

[2] Kaibel (1887-1890).

[3] Cf. Jacoby *FGrHist* 107 (II B, p. 343-344).

[4] Laqueur (1929: 2463-2467).

opinion on S. and on the work under discussion was questioned in the subsequent decades by a number of scholars. The most influential modern views have been those of Schachermeyr[5], Coletti[6], Meister[7], Strasburger[8], Carawan[9] and recently Tsakmakis[10]. Hence after some necessary remarks on the life and the other works of S. I shall concentrate on characterizing the views of Jacoby and the above-mentioned scholars.

S. of Thasos had a reputation among his contemporaries as a ῥαψῳδός (cf. T 4 and F 21-25) and as an expert on the interpretation of Homer's epics (T 3)[11]. In Plato's *Ion* the famous reciter of epic poems Ion gives praise to S., Metrodoros of Lampsakos and Glaukon[12]. It is important to bear in mind that S. was first and foremost looked upon (and probably saw himself) as a professional performer of and expert on epics, but not as a historian or biographer. Antimachos of Kolophon, one of S.'s pupils (T 5), followed in his footsteps by pursuing a career as poet, learned scholar and prolific writer.

There can be no doubt that S. personally knew some of the leading Athenian statesmen of the fifth century, especially Kimon and Perikles (cf. T 1-2). Both Plutarch and Athenaios stress S.' contemporaneity with his subjects. Maybe S. himself had also stressed this point. S. died in the 420's (a short time?) after Perikles' death and the end of the plague (cf. F 11). The born Thasian had been living in Athens for a certain time, but we have no exact dates. S. may have left his native soil as early as 463 B.C. after Kimon had suppressed the rebellion of the Thasians. Strasburger[13] presumed that S.'s Athenian sojourn is to be dated before the publication of his work *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. This chronological guess, however, depends on Strasburger's interpretation of the general outlook of that work, which he took to be a harsh denunciation of the leading democratic statesmen and

---

[5] Schachermeyr (1965: 1-23 = 1974: 151-174).
[6] Coletti (1974-75: 61-125).
[7] Meister (1978: 274-294).
[8] Strasburger (1986: 1-11 = 1990: 341-351).
[9] Carawan (1989: 144-161).
[10] Tsakmakis (1995: 129-152).
[11] See Richardson (1975: 65-81, especially p. 71-72); Gentili – Cerri (1988: 69).
[12] See Nihard (1958: 4) on Glaukon who is mentioned in Aristot. *Poet.* 25 p. 1461b 1. It is not necessary to change the name Glaukon and to read Glaukos (of Rhegion), author of a work entitled Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν (edition and commentary forthcoming in *FGrHist* IV B).
[13] Strasburger (1990: 348-351).

of the whole imperialistic foreign policy of Athens, which had assumed the role of the hegemonical power of the Delian Confederacy. As it is, we have in the undisputed fragments no hint in regard to the exact date of the publication of this work, although Jacoby's opinion that it was one of his latest works and was completed soon after the death of Perikles is still an attractive theory. The fact that Kleon is never alluded to in our fragments can hardly be the outcome of pure accident or the small number of fragments preserved from S.'s works.

It is not difficult to see why a specialist in explaining and in performing the Homeric epics and a man obviously interested in religion chose to write a book *On Homeric Problems*, some fragments of which we possess[14], and a treatise *On Mystery-Cults* (Περὶ τελετῶν)[15]. Speculations that because of his attested interest in mystery-cults S. may even be the author of the famous Orphic Derveni-papyrus are not convincing, although S. does seem to have been familiar with Orphic religion[16]. Anyway, *On Mystery-Cults* is of great interest for research in the field of Greek religion, as *On Homeric Problems* is for Homeric scholarship. *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*, however, remains S.'s only work of interest for the present collection of fragments pertaining to Greek biography. Eleven fragments of this remarkable treatise have come down to us and are all to be found in three of Plutarch's biographies (*Themistokles*, *Kimon* and *Perikles*), with the exception of one important quotation from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai* (F 10a). It is striking that no other extant ancient author before Plutarch quotes from this work of S. over a period of more than 500 years. But this fact only bears witness to the rarity of S.'s work and may not be used to jump to conclusions concerning its literary qualities or importance as a source for the lives of leading Athenian statesmen of the fifth century B.C. The simple fact that ten out of eleven fragments are from Plutarch makes it difficult to classify S.'s work in a given literary genre and to attempt generalizing statements on its tendency. Some of the fragments may be more characteristic of Plutarch's interests as a biographer and excerptor than of the general style of the original work.

---

[14] Stesimbrotos *FGrHist* 107 T 3-4 on his reputation as a reciter and explainer of epic poems and F 21-25, which contain pieces of historical information on Homer (F 21-22) and discuss hermeneutical problems (F 23-25).

[15] Stesimbrotos *FGrHist* 107 F 12 and probably also F 13-20 (and 26-27 ?), although these fragments have come down to us without a reference to *On Mystery-Cults* as their original source.

[16] Cf. Burkert (1986: 1-5).

Jacoby took *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* to be our earliest known example of a political pamphlet in Greek literature: "das waren keine memoiren, wie Ions ᾿Επιδημίαι—denn St. hat Themistokles sicher nicht mehr gesehen—, auch kein geschichtliches oder biographisches werk ..... der inhalt zeigt vielmehr zweifelsfrei, daß es eine politische tendenzschrift war ... die älteste uns bekannte und wohl wirklich die erste in der reihe der meist feindseligen musterungen der athenischen volksführer"[17]. Its aim was, according to Jacoby and his followers, to attack the imperialistic foreign policy of Athens and the hegemonical city's behaviour towards its former allies in the Delian Confederacy. It was written from the point of view of the allies, which included the Thasians, who were suppressed by Athens. Jacoby drew comparisons between *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* and the well-known anonymous pamphlet which is usually refered to as the *Athenaion Politeia* of Pseudo-Xenophon (or the treatise of the so-called "Old Oligarch")[18]. But whereas the "Old Oligarch" concentrated his criticism on Athens' democratic constitution and explained Athens' imperialist foreign policy as a function and consequence of this constitution, S. based his fundamental criticism of Athens on the character and the faults of the city's leading statesmen as the typical representatives of the "spirit of Athens" and her imperialistic foreign policy and as models of "democratic man". If *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* was a pamphlet, one would like to know which of the leading Athenian politicians or who outside Athens actually used this pamphlet in an attack against Athenian naval imperialism, for which Themistokles had laid the foundation with his naval bill and which had reached its peak under Perikles' leadership.

At first sight, this interpretation of the character and aims of S. looks attractive. But there are some weak points in it, which were picked up

---

[17] Jacoby in his introduction to the commentary on *FGrHist* 107 (II B, p. 343); Jacoby was deeply influenced in his opinion of S. by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1877: 326-367, especially p. 361-367), whom he explicitly quotes for the character of the work; for the interpretation of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* as a "Flugschrift des Stesimbrotos gegen die Initiatoren der attischen Reichspolitik" and a "Zeugnis für das Interesse des Publikums an Klatsch und persönlichen Details und für sein Bedürfnis, Personen des öffentlichen Lebens gezeichnet und gedeutet zu erhalten," see also Dihle (1970: 49-50).

[18] Cf. Frisch (1942: 63-87) on the topics of sea-power and democratic imperialism in this work; Treu (1967: 1928-1982); Leduc (1976: 29-36) on some attempts to date the treatise and (1976: 36-45) on the author's political position; see also Bleicken (1994²: 569-576) with useful remarks on the "innere Einstellung des Atheners zur Demokratie".

especially by Schachermeyr[19]. In the extant fragments there is no explicit criticism of a given event in the imperialist foreign policy of Athens, which one might expect in F 2, 5 or 8, and notably not even of Athens' brutal treatment of Thasos, S.'s native island. It was Jacoby's profound knowledge of the history of Athenian foreign policy and the domestic quarrels of the leading politicians (and perhaps the authority of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff) that led him to draw up his over-subtle interpretation. According to Schachermeyr himself the main purpose of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* was to scrutinize the παιδεία (education and culture) and the ἦθος (character) of the leading Athenian statesmen in S.'s time, not to establish their political positions and compare them with Athenian imperialism as a political concept. According to this interpretation the work should be regarded as a treatise on education and character anticipating later similar Peripatetic studies. Indeed most of the extant fragments are concerned with episodes in the lives of the heroes and their sayings and contain observations of S. on the education, way of life and character of the three leading statesmen Themistokles, Kimon and Perikles. Frost[20] held that S. (as a professional ῥαψῳδός and explainer of the Homeric epics, which formed the basis of all Greek education until the sophistic movement of the fifth century) may have shared a critical attitude towards the sophists and the new παιδεία taught by them. Contemporaries thought that Perikles was heavily influenced by modern sophistic and philosophical theories. S. may have wanted to illustrate the dangerous consequences of the new concept of education, political concurrence and "might and right".

Another influential interpretation of S. is that of Meister; he understands the work quite differently to Jacoby and—following earlier interpretations by Stuart and Osley—takes it to be an early example of Greek biography[21]. In his view all of the characteristic features of the literary genre such as it was developed over the subsequent centuries were *in nuce* already to be found in S. Meister stresses the moralizing tendency, the lively characterization of the main persons attested in our fragments, and the frequent use of anecdotal material to illustrate the character and moral standing of the heroes. Meister has made valuable observations on the contents of the fragments. That a

---

19 Schachermeyr (1965).

20 Frost (1980: 17).

21 Meister (1978: 274-294, esp. 293-294); this view had already been held by Stuart (1928: 45-46) and Osley (1946: 8-9) who stressed the declamatory nature of the treatment of the main persons; it was recently proposed again by Pelling (1990: 215).

"biographical" interest was displayed in this work, cannot be disputed, even if one should be very cautious in accepting Meister's confidence in having identified an early example of fully developed Greek biography (see commentaries on F 4 and 10b).

Carawan[22] proposed a double thesis: that the fragments of S. reveal the general economy of the whole work that was deeply influenced by the epic tradition and, secondly, that it had been the purpose of the passage on Themistokles in Thukydides' first book to refute S.'s earlier version in *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. But in my opinion, both central points in this thesis have recently and convincingly been disproved by Tsakmakis[23].

Leo regarded *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* as a "Pamphlet" and a piece of "ältere politische Literatur" and also took S. to be a precursor of the historian Theopompos and of his excursus on the Athenian demagogues[24]. Following this line Coletti understood the work as "un' opera storico-politica", because our main source, Plutarch, himself did not consider S.'s work to be an "assortimento di anedotti senza nesso" but "un racconto storico coerente"[25]. Similarly Tsakmakis recently defended the view that *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* is a historical work with a central interest very different from the contemporary "great" historiography of Herodotos and especially Thukydides. Tsakmakis pointed to Plutarch's critical remarks against S. (see below), in which the biographer assigns literary qualities (or faults!) to S. which according to Thukydides' methodological remarks in the first book of his *Histories* were typical of the contemporary λογογράφοι of the fifth century, the historical prose-writers whom Thukydides disdained[26]. The leading statesmen of Athens, their personalities, deeds and sayings, their constant rivalries and enmities in the public as well as in the private sphere, not in the least their personal weaknesses and the negative aspects of these fascinating individuals were the central theme of S. Still, in characterizing the theme of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* in this way, Tsakmakis himself to a certain degree admits a "biographical" focus of the work.

---

[22] Carawan (1989: 144-161).

[23] Tsakmakis (1995: 131-138).

[24] Leo (1901: 108).

[25] Coletti (1974-75: 70 and 81). When quoting from S. Plutarch three times uses the verb ἱστορεῖ (Plut. *Them.* 4,5; 24,7; *Cim.* 16,1). See also Coletti (1974-75: 88-112) for extensive commentaries on F 1-11 and 29 Jacoby.

[26] Cf. Thuk. 1,20-22 and Tsakmakis (1995: 150-152).

Judging from the extant fragments, there can be no question about it that the work is a precursor of fully developed Greek biography. In comparison with the predominantly anecdotal character of the Ἐπιδημίαι or *Memoirs* of S.'s contemporary Ion of Chios[27] it is significant that S. chooses a title which has a definitely clearer biographical implication making three leading Athenian statesmen the main theme of his work. Ion of Chios and the "Old Oligarch" may both have been models for S., but that assumption depends upon the disputed dates of publication of the two works. There is no decisive ancient testimony which can be adduced as proof that S. actually knew the two works.

After this short survey of modern views on the literary character of S.'s *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* a word of caution may not be out of place. From a modern point of view one could easily overstress the allegedly sharp differences between the literary forms of biography, history, and political treatises in works of Greek prose written during the second half of the fifth century. With the exception of the poetical genres (and judicial oratory, which had already been taught and described as a separate prose genre by Korax and Teisias and the early Sophists) no clear-cut and accepted division between the literary genres of Greek prose had been established about 430 B.C., when S. presumably wrote *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*.

---

[27] On Ion see *FGrHist* 392; von Blumenthal (1939) is still a useful collection, but has been recently superseded by Leurini (1992); some passages in the *Lexikon* of Photios were thought to be possible additional fragments from Ion by Leurini (1984: 156-173); modern scholarly discussion on Ion's life and works may be found in Jacoby (1947: 1-17) repr. in: Jacoby (1956: 144-168); see also Huxley (1965: 29-46), von Fritz (1967: 94-97), Dover (1986: 12-37 = Dover 1988: 1-12), West (1985: 71-78) and Strasburger (1990: 342-348). Ion produced his first tragedy in 452-448 B.C. (Ol. 82) and was dead by 421 B.C. (Aristoph. *Pax* 827-837). Fragments from Ion's Συνεκδημητικός (Πρεσβευτικός) (*FGrHist* 392 F 8) and his Ἐπιδημίαι (*FGrHist* 392 F 6-7) are of interest for the lives of Sophokles, Perikles, Euripides and Aischylos, but the general character of Ion's work is anecdotal rather than biographical. Hence these passages have not been included in the present collection. But the reader may nevertheless consult them for telling comparisons with the fragments of S.'s *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. One important difference lies in the choice of persons, because S. confined himself to Athenian politicians and generals (as far as we can see in the preserved fragments and can conclude from the title), whereas Ion also wrote on poets. Ion concentrated on narrating his own meetings at Chios or in other Greek cities with famous contemporaries, but S. used the whole oral tradition in *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. Ion's gallery of portraits has been described by Gentili – Cerri (1988: 69) in a suitable comparison as "a series of close-ups." Stuart (1928: 49) has aptly remarked that "both Ion and Stesimbrotos show that from the middle of the century on there was a public appetite for the episodic and the sensational in the private life of contemporary figures."

It was at about the same time that Herodotos, the "*pater historiae*", was still working on the last books of his *Historiai*, later considered to be the first distinctively historiographical work, and Ion and the "Old Oligarch" published their treatises as pioneering works. The modern discussion on the literary genre of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*, which tries to differentiate sharply between the prose-genres of political pamphlet, memoirs, early biographies and historiography with a special interest in the leading persons of the time, and which tries to assign the scanty extant fragments of S. to one of these genres may be ultimately misleading, because such a discussion has to use literary *termini technici* and intellectual categories of differentiation which were not developed in the Greek world until the second half of the 4th century B.C. (in the Peripatos) or even until the age of Hellenistic scholarship (in Alexandreia or Pergamon). Jacoby himself may have been too hasty in his judgement on S. and his strict denial of the possibly biographical or historiographical character of the work.

To judge from the contents of the extant fragments Kimon was a prominent figure in S.'s *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*, although he was not mentioned in its title: in Plutarch's *Life of Kimon* Stesimbrotos is used as an important contemporary source on Kimon's life. But the three Athenians mentioned in the title must have been treated in a more comprehensive or prominent way than their contemporary Kimon. This reasoning leads to the conclusion that S.'s remarks on Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles must have been very detailed in the original and complete version of his work. One can only speculate on the way in which Thukydides[28], son of Melesias and Perikles' political rival, was described by S. The main, if not the only reason for the absence of Thukydides in the preserved fragments may be the simple fact that Plutarch did not write a *Life of Thukydides*. If the title of his work was meant to have any chronological implications S. did not divide it into three successive periods under the leadership of three Athenian politicians. Otherwise he would have had to mention Kimon in his title instead of Thukydides as the representative general and politician between the eras of Themistokles and Perikles. Nor do the three politicians Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles stand for three different political programmes either in foreign or in domestic policy. Only Perikles and

---

[28] On Thukydides, son of Melesias, see KIRCHNER (1901-1903) PA 7268 and DAVIES (1971: 230-237); MEYER (1967: 141-154), KLEIN (1979: 494-533) and BLEICKEN (1994: 571-572).

Thukydides, son of Melesias, were thought of and represented in contemporary literature as political opponents. Themistokles and Perikles are criticized by S., but there is no sound basis in our sources for the hypothesis that the third politician, Thukydides, may have been contrasted favourably to the other two. If S. had wanted to give his readers a positive model of an Athenian politician and general, he might have chosen Miltiades[29] who had practised a less demagogic style of policy than the three heroes mentioned in his title. The preserved fragments of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* show S.'s pursuit of originality and richness of—often unreliable—details. At any rate, his work should not be underrated as an important early testimony for the development of the ambivalent biographical picture of Themistokles[30], Kimon[31] and Perikles[32].

The fragments show S.'s interest in personal qualities and significant features of character: they describe typical anecdotes or aspects of the private lives of the three persons prominent in our texts, in particular their education, family and sexual life. Their important political careers and an evaluation of their role in the political and military history of Athens seem to have interested S. less[33]. Plutarch despised S. as an unreliable witness to historical events and the political and military facts in the lives of his heroes. All the same, he specifically mentions S. as his source for juicy stories in the three *Lives* of Themistokles, Kimon and Perikles, and he most likely drew on him for further anecdotes and episodes in the same lives, without naming his source.

Unfortunately it is impossible to identify on the basis of sound methodological criteria those additional uncredited passages where Plutarch might have borrowed from S. The problem is similar to the equally unsuccessful attempts to determine which passages in Plutarch's *Lives*, especially in the *Life of Themistokles*, can be identified as emanating from Ion of Chios or Phainias of Eresos apart from the passages in which Plutarch explicitly acknowledges them as his sources. Passages

---

[29] Cf. on Miltiades DAVIES (1971: 301-305), and STESIMBROTOS F 2 and 4 with commentary.

[30] Cf. for early sources on Themistokles PICCIRILLI (1987: 3-52).

[31] Cf. PICCIRILLI (1987: 73-89).

[32] On modern scholarly opinions about Perikles and his role in Athenian history, see recently SCHUBERT (1994) and WILL (1995).

[33] With the exception of F 2 on Themistokles and Miltiades; one may again compare S.'s range of interest with that of his contemporary Ion of Chios.

in Plutarch's *Lives* which hint at S.[34] as the likely source, may, in view of their common thematic interests, just as well come from Ion of Chios, from Phainias of Eresos, from contemporary comedies or even from learned Hellenistic commentaries. The problem is rendered more difficult by Plutarch's method of mixing a direct quotation, his own memories of his reading and his (in this case mainly critical) commentary on such quotations or memories in one and the same paragraph of his biographies. As a general rule, Plutarch used S. to embellish his main historiographical sources. Thus he wanted to make his biographies more attractive reading, even though he often sharply dissociates himself from S.'s version of events. S. was a master in the art of characterizing his prominent contemporaries by making subtle personal remarks and by recounting anecdotes which reveal the public opinion on them as it was expressed in the works of contemporary comedy. This talent is illustrated by his well-known remark on the "Peloponnesian" character of Kimon (F 4) and may well have been a general feature of his work. Ion of Chios may have been more reserved in his political judgement of Themistokles, Perikles and Athenian foreign policy than S.[35]. But in the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to reconstruct the exact political position of S. and to compare it with the positions of the leading Athenian statesmen of the fifth century. Hence it is misleading to stress (as some modern scholars have done) S.'s supposed sympathy with the Athenian opposition to Themistokles and Perikles, i.e. to the policy associated with Kimon and Thukydides, son of Melesias. Kimon's portrait consists of a mixture of positive and negative features, and it would actually be a big surprise to see Kimon of all Athenians treated by S. as an ideal politician, since he was one of the "hawks" who advocated an aggressive maritime policy for the Delian Confederacy in the 470s and 460s and personally took charge of the suppression of the rebellion of S.'s native island Thasos in 463 B.C.

Commentary on F 1-11

(1) F 1-3 are from Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles*. For extensive general information on Themistokles and for all ancient parallels to the following passages quoted from S. the reader is referred to the recent

[34] E.g. Plut. *Them.* 24,3-5; *Per.* 10,5; 12,1-6; 14,1-3 and 29,1-3 may ultimately come from S., too; but see Tsakmakis (1995: 133-138).

[35] This is Strasburger's view (1990: 350-351); see also Jacoby's commentary on Stesimbrotos *FGrHist* 107 (II B, p. 343-349).

commentaries by Podlecki and Frost and to an important study by Gruen[36].

Themistokles is said to have studied with Anaxagoras and Melissos (F 1). The next fragment (F 2) is about the most important political measure taken by Themistokles, and it informs us that he had the famous decree to build the fleet of warships passed in the Athenian assembly in spite of Miltiades' opposition. But this was common historical knowledge. It may perhaps be adduced as proof of the political preferences of S., but not as proof of the political scope of the whole work. F 3 gives details about the arranged flight of Themistokles' family from Athens and the resulting accusations against and condemnation of Epikrates, and furthermore mentions Sicily as the (improbable) first place where the exiled Themistokles went to live. In these three quotations, as in most other quotations taken from *Kimon* and *Perikles*, Plutarch makes it clear enough that he thinks little of S.'s chronological or historical trustworthiness[37].

By associating Themistokles with sophists, philosophers of nature, modern doctors and (from S.'s point of view disreputable) people like Anaxagoras and Melissos S. suggested to his readers that Themistokles was no traditional aristocrat and no μουσικὸς ἀνήρ, that is, no good man and partisan of the old παιδεία and of the traditional culture personified by ῥαψῳδοί and explainers of Homer, such as S. himself. Plutarch rejects the unjust insinuations that Themistokles lacked traditional culture and education with a simple yet effective chronological argument: Anaxagoras and Melissos were too young to have been Themistokles' teachers, since they were contemporaries of the much younger Perikles[38]. In F 1 Plutarch convicts S. of a grave chronological mistake. He then immediately adds the correct name of one of Themistokles' teachers, Mnesiphilos of Phrearria. This Athenian was neither a ῥήτωρ (i.e. a sophist) nor a φυσικὸς φιλόσοφος (i.e. a philosopher of nature) but a teacher of σοφία (i.e. of "wisdom") in the sense of cleverness in politics and practical sagacity in the unbroken tradition of Solon. It has already been suggested by

---

[36] Cf. Gruen (1970: 91-98); Podlecki (1975); Lenardon (1978); Frost (1980); see also Coletti (1974-75: 88-93) on F 1 and Davies (1971: 214-218) on Themistokles and his children.

[37] Cf. Plut. *Cim.* 4,5; 16,1; Plut. *Per.* 13,16 und 26,1 and the remarks in the commentary below.

[38] For the controversial dates of the ἀκμή of Anaxagoras and Melissos see the discussion in Frost (1980: 67 n. 21).

Jacoby[39] that S. did not necessarily invent these pieces of information on Themistokles' education, but may have taken them from existing traditions hostile to him. In that case, S. may nevertheless have been the first to extend and embellish these traditions and to present them in a literary form.

(2) Whereas Jacoby thought that Plut. *Them.* 4,4-5 was taken from S. and that Plutarch had inserted a quotation from Plato in the context of a larger quotation from S., the contrary may be assumed with an equal degree of plausibility. Frost[40] has maintained in his commentary that Plutarch inserted the quotation from S. in a philosophical context indicated by the quotation from Plato[41].

In this fragment the correct translation of the Greek demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα ("these") is not clear. What does ταῦτα refer to[42]? Did Miltiades only oppose the naval bill or (more likely) the whole package of political and military measures by means of which Themistokles and his followers sought to change the Athenians from "steadfast hoplites" who were proud of their victory at Marathon into "sea-tossed" mariners and rowers, who were disdained by Miltiades and S., and, in the final analysis, into harsh imperialists? S. was mainly interested in Themistokles' opposition to (and his victory over) Miltiades. Hence only 4,5 was printed in expanded size, and 4,4 in normal letters. But if S. indeed described Miltiades as a politician who opposed to the fleet as the instrument of power to carry out Athen's new imperial ambitions on a broader scale, Miltiades may have been presented as a favorable contrast to Themistokles and Perikles. F 2 again illustrates the chronological carelessness of S. In all probability Miltiades died before the naval bill of Themistokles was passed. Jacoby was right when he stated that S. probably did not try hard to find out the exact date of Miltiades' death. Chronological mistakes and untrustworthiness in regard to important historical facts do not support the hypothesis that S. aimed to write a historical work in the strict sense[43]. But it may be noted that the two biggest mistakes in the

---

[39] Jacoby's commentary on *FGrHist* 107 F 1 (II B, p. 345).

[40] Frost (1980: 87).

[41] Cf. Plat. *Leg.* 706c and Plutarch's remark on the philosophical nature of the question of whether Themistokles did injury to the integrity and purity of public life or not in the following lines Plut. *Them.* 4,5.

[42] Cf. Frost (1980: 86-87).

[43] Cf. Jacoby's commentary on *FGrHist* 107 F 1 (II B, p. 345); but see Coletti (1974-75: 93-96) on F 2, who regards S. as a more trustworthy author in chronological matters.

eleven extant fragments come from his remarks on Themistokles, whom S. did not know personally, because he belonged to the generation before him. Perhaps S. was better informed in regard to chronological details concerning Thukydides, son of Melesias, Perikles.

(3) According to F 3 S. at first claimed that Themistokles had his wife and children follow him into exile with the help of an Athenian named Epikrates some time after he himself had reached the court of the Molossian king Admetos; we are then told that Themistokles tried to find a place of exile in Sicily before he finally settled in Asia. Plutarch now accuses S. of contradicting himself, because he forgot the presence of Themistokles, his wife and children at Admetos' court and made him sail to Sicily: there the Athenian is said to have asked the tyrant Hieron for the hand of his daughter and to have promised him to make all the Hellenes his subjects. Only after the failure of this first plan does S. relate Themistokles' well-known flight to Asia. S. obviously gave a less reliable account of the famous flight into exile than our best sources for these events, especially Thukydides[44], and, moreover, S. lost himself in contradictions. The choice was between two versions, one in which Themistokles fled to Epeiros and another according to which he fled to Sicily. Plutarch takes Epikrates to be the name of Themistokles' helper, and rejects Sicily as the place of exile Themistokles wished to travel to. If S. did not provide a coherent and chronologically well-ordered account of Themistokles' life, but only a series of episodes and anecdotes such as F 3, which were selected to portray Themistokles as an unreliable person and a clever imperialist, this fragment would be of great importance for the general character of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* and provide evidence for not taking the work to be historiographical.

Epikrates of Acharnai, the alleged helper of Themistokles in the arranged flight of his family, is known only from this passage[45]. One can only speculate on the motives S. had in mind when he made Themistokles depart in a westward direction to Sicily. But here, as in

---

[44] For the version of our best sources see Thuk. 1,135,2-1,138,6 and Plut. *Them.* 24,1-7 with commentaries; Carawan (1989: 144-161) and Tsakmakis (1995: 131-135). Coletti (1974-75: 96-101), however, did not see convincing reasons for rejecting the tradition of Themistokles' flight to Sicily before Hieron's death in 466 B.C.

[45] But Epikrates may be a relative of two later homonymous Athenians from the demos Acharnai who are mentioned at the end of the 4th century: see *IG* II^2 505.5 and 1492 B. 110-11 with Kirchner (1901) *PA* 4886 and Osborne – Byrne (1994) Epikrates No. 26.

the fragment in which Cyprus (instead of Kaunos) is said to be the real goal of a naval expedition led by Perikles in the Samian War (F 8), S.[46] extends the geographical area of action in comparison with our other and more reliable contemporary sources, especially Thukydides.

(4-7) F 4-7 come from Plutarch's biography of Kimon. For his *Kimon* Plutarch was able to make use of many contemporary sources from different literary genres[47]. In *Kimon* Plutarch quotes by name no less than 17 authors as his sources, and one can confidently add to this list the works of Herodotos, Thukydides and Theopompos, who are not quoted by name, but form the historiographical basis of Plutarch's broad knowledge of Kimon's time. Plutarch consulted Ion, Stesimbrotos, Gorgias, Kritias, Archelaos, Melanthios, Kratinos, Eupolis and Aristophanes: these names indicate the wide range of his first-hand knowledge of the fifth century B.C. Hence he did not have to rely on Hellenistic formal biographies of Kimon as intermediate sources, the existence of which has been postulated among others by Ed. Meyer, based on a view of Plutarch's working method which by now has been discarded by scholarship on Plutarch[48]. If such Hellenistic intermediary sources were known to him at all, he chose not to mention them, but to consult the "primary", i.e. contemporary sources.

Plutarch disdains S.'s historical trustworthiness, but at the same time highly values him as an irreplaceable source for the lively description of his heroes' characters. Plutarch's *Kimon* must play a major role in any discussion on the character of S.'s *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* : one third of the total number of fragments from this work are found in this *vita*. This may be explained as a reflection of the special

---

[46] By quoting from Theophrastos Plutarch gives another argument to demonstrate the unreliability of S.'s version of Themistokles' flight to Sicily. Theophrastos had reported in his treatise Περὶ Βασιλείας or *On Kingship* (PLUT. *Them.* 25,1 = F 126 WIMMER = F 612 FORTENBAUGH) a story that Themistokles some time before his flight into exile had tried to incite the multitude of Greek spectators assembled at the Olympics to tear down the tent of the Sicilian tyrant Hieron. Therefore it is improbable that Themistokles could have tried to sail to Sicily in the hope of finding a safe haven at Hieron's court. But Theophrastos seems to have confused a story about the tyrant Dionysios I (in 388 B.C.?) with another about Themistokles and the earlier tyrant Hieron.

[47] On the sources of Plutarch's *Kimon*, see now BLAMIRE (1989: 4-10).

[48] See on Plutarch's *Kimon* e.g. FLACELIÈRE (1972: 6-13) and BLAMIRE (1989: 4-10) and on Plutarch's working method in general FROST (1980), STADTER (1989) and PODLECKI – DUANE (1992).

interest of the Thasian S. in Kimon as the Athenian general who was in command of the military expedition against his native island, although this crucial event in Kimon's career is not at all treated in the extant fragments from the Thasian point of view. Kimon's very limited intellectual capacity and his lack of liberal education and Attic sophistication are mentioned (F 4). His improper relations with his sister Elpinike and her scandalous behaviour towards the painter Polygnotos and the orator Perikles, who was a political enemy and an accuser of her brother, are related in fragment 5. A debate about the name of Kimon's wife (F 6) and sons and a characteristic saying praising the Spartan character and criticizing the Athenian demos (F 7) are further themes found in Plutarch's quotations taken from S. in *Kimon*. No fragment, however, is devoted exclusively to a discussion of Kimon's role in the political or military history of fifth-century Athens or to a systematic comparison of his position with that of Themistokles, Thukydides or Perikles. The political enmity between Perikles in his early days and Kimon is only the starting-point for the following anecdote on Elpinike and Perikles. There is no explicit word of approval or fundamental criticism of the foreign policy of Kimon in the extant fragments of S. In F 5 he quotes the apology of Kimon, which mentions some catchwords from Kimon's position on foreign policy, but S. does not comment on the pro-Spartan attitude of Kimon in political terms[49]. As in the *Lives* of Themistokles and Perikles it is sheer guesswork which passages of the *Kimon* come from S. in addition to the fragments quoted with explicit reference to him in Plutarch. Blamire has recently discussed the problem and tentatively suggested some more passages[50].

(4) Pelling remarked on fragments 1,4 and 6 that "material on childhood featured quite prominently in that fifth-century precursor of political biography"[51]. In F 4 S. reminds his readers of the dissolute reputation of young Kimon, his bibulous manners, his taking after his simple grandfather Kimon, nicknamed 'Booby', his lack of literary and liberal education and well-mannered civilization as revealed in the typical power and fluency of Attic speech[52]. This is by no means

---

[49] Or Plutarch does not cite S.'s comments. Plutarch only mentiones that Kimon incurred the open hatred of his Athenian fellow-citizens for his pro-Spartan attitudes and sayings (F 6-7).

[50] Cf. Plut. *Cim.* 4,6; 4,8; 15,3 and Blamire (1989: 6).

[51] Pelling (1990: 215).

[52] Cf. LSJ (1940 = 1977: 966) *s.v.* κοάλεμος; perhaps S. was also alluding to the fact that in his youth Kimon had been living for some time in Thrace.

a positive appraisal of Kimon, and it is not compensated for by the few neutral or even positive observations that follow, namely that in his behaviour there was much nobility and truthfulness, and the subtle and pertinent observation of his plain "Peloponnesian" character. These positive aspects of Kimon's portrayal belong to the original quotation from S. and are not Plutarch's addition, which begins with the quotation from Euripides[53]. One should not draw far-reaching conclusions from them in regard to the general character of S.'s work[54]. But it is obvious that S., by giving praise to Kimon's "Peloponnesian" character (cf. F 7), wished to make a political statement. It is not necessary to suppose that S. only gave clear-cut, black-and-white characterizations of leading politicians or that he was a partisan of Kimon's domestic or foreign policy.

It is not easy to decide how much of the following slander on Kimon's improper relations with his sister Elpinike and the latter's scandalous affair with the painter Polygnotos was already reported by S. or was invented at a later date. It seems that the stories about Elpinike became increasingly more scandalous in the course of time[55]. S.'s reason for attacking Polygnotos, a fellow countryman, in the treatise may have been that the painter was famous in Athens and was on friendly terms with Kimon. Judging from his known interests in Kimon and Elpinike (F 5) S. could be credited with the whole passage *Kimon* 4,4-8. On the other hand Plutarch quotes some "historians"[56] and a verse of the poet Melanthios in the same paragraph. Therefore Jacoby thought that Plutarch had inserted the sentences on Elpinike from his reading of the works of "the historians" and of Melanthios in the context of his quotation from S. This seems to be the most likely solution.

(5) In this fragment S. tells the story of Kimon's defence against unspecified accusations after he had been in command of an Athenian naval expedition in the northern Aegean and around the Macedonian coast. But these accusations and the political and legal context of the process merely serve as a preamble to the well-known anecdote

---

[53] Cf. COLETTI (1974-75: 101-102) with some reservations and FUSCAGNI (1989: 64 and n. 105), but see GOMME – ANDREWES – DOVER I (1945: 36 n. 2).

[54] For a discussion of Kimon's characterization see JACOBY's commentaries on F 4; see also GOMME – ANDREWES – DOVER I (1945: 36 n. 2) on Kimon's (and Perikles') relations with women and most recently BLAMIRE's short commentary (1989: 94) on PLUT. *Cim.* 4,5.

[55] PLUT. *Cim.* 4,6-8; cf. DIOD. 10,31 and NEP. *Cim.* 1,2.

[56] That means, among other historians, probably Ephoros.

on Elpinike's attempted delicate deal with Perikles, who was one of Kimon's accusers.

In all probability, S. is referring to accusations which were brought against Kimon immediately after his return from the campaign against Thasos (and Macedonia) in 463 B.C. If one goes along with Stadter's chronological considerations[57] the trial must have taken place before the Areiopagos council and not before one of the courts of the people. The exact wording of the accusation and the technical aspects of the trial are not clear. It may have been a δίκη εὐθύνης after the end of Kimon's generalship or some other form of case for bribery, which was one of the accusations according to S. Kimon's acquittal stirred up the political zeal of Ephialtes and Perikles to transfer legal jurisdiction pertaining to the accountability of the most important magistrates and generals from the Areiopagos council to the people's courts in 462/61 B.C.

Perikles' motives for proving a mild accuser during Kimon's trial are all but clear. Blamire[58] proposes the explanation that young Perikles, still in the early stage of his career, was urged by influential politicians, against his own will, to act as one of Kimon's accusers. If Perikles was one of them, the opponents of Kimon expected to be as successful with their accusation as Xanthippos had been against Miltiades, Kimon's father, after the expedition against Paros in 489 B.C. But Perikles correctly anticipated the decision of the judges and took the floor against Kimon as a mere formality and without eagerness. The story of Elpinike, who came to Perikles' house as an already old (or, at least by Athenian standards, elderly) lady and offered him a "private deal" in order to help her brother against the imminent dangerous accusations, will have delighted the readers of S. and was narrated even by Plutarch despite his sober judgement on such stories. Elpinike's unconventional way of life and her shocking behaviour in the eyes of many of her contemporaries occasioned the invention of such stories. Even the otherwise reticent Plutarch does not think it impossible that she indeed had an improper relationship with Perikles or at least tried to persuade him to pursue her brother's recall from exile after he had been ostracised[59]. We do not know the

---

[57] Cf. STADTER (1989: 126-128) on PLUT. *Per.* 10,6 and on STESIMBROTOS F 5.

[58] BLAMIRE (1989: 157); a similar opinion seems to have been shared by the source of ARISTOT. *Resp. Ath.* 27,1.

[59] PLUT. *Per.* 10,5-6 is derived, in substance, from S., see STADTER (1989: 127) and TSAKMAKIS (1995: 136-137); cf. also ATHEN. 13,589e.

exact date of her birth, but she may have been in her 40s at the end of the 460s, if in 489 she was still a young and unmarried girl[60]. S. primarily told the story of Elpinike and Perikles for the amusement of his readers, or else chose to narrate it because he himself disdained the fact that she, a mere woman, uttered political opinions in public and tried to act as a mediator between her brother and his opponents.

(6) Again, F 6 illustrates S.'s lively interest in details concerning the family and private life of leading contemporary politicians. S. spread the insinuation in his *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* that Kimon's twin sons Lakedaimonios and Eleios (or perhaps, in the better reading of this name, Oulios, pointing to the Delian Apollo) were born of a woman of the Arcadian town Kleitor, that is, a foreign woman or one of a questionable civic lineage. This was a clear assault on Kimon himself and on his sons. About the time of S.'s writing (ca. 430 B.C.) the restrictive Periclean law on citizenship of 451 B.C. had become the starting-point for some stock assaults in contemporary comedy and presumably in the daily quarrels of political opponents in the assembly and before the courts. It had become fashionable to question the civic status of one's enemy by proclaiming that his mother was a foreigner or a woman of bad reputation[61]. The sons of Kimon (along with the children of Perikles and Sokrates) are among the examples given by Aristotle for his observation that children of famous parents often do not live up to their prominent lineage and to the reputation of their parents[62]. But the philosopher gives no hint that they were called μητρόξενοι or foreigners on their mother's side[63]. There are only few modern scholars, including Stadter[64], who do not reject S.'s version *a limine*: if Kimon was married to a foreign woman, before he married his Athenian wife Isodike, the daughter of Euryptolemos, or if he had a concubine during his marriage with Isodike, he may have had children by another woman, too.

---

[60] See PLUT. *Cim.* 4,4.

[61] Cf. BLAMIRE (1989: 163); also PLUT. *Cim.* 16,1; PLUT. *Per.* 29,1-2.

[62] ARISTOT. *Rhet.* 2,15,3 1390 b 28 on Kimon's sons; but see RAUBITSCHEK (1949: 135) for a dedication, which was made by Lakedaimonios, one of Kimon's sons, as a *hipparchos* about 446 B.C.

[63] For the μητρόξενοι and the law on citizenship cf. ARISTOT. *Resp. Ath.* 26,3 with commentaries by RHODES (1981: 331-335) and CHAMBERS (1990: 263-265).

[64] For a discussion of the *status quaestionis* of our knowledge on Kimon's family and his children see STADTER (1989: 267-268) in his commentary on PLUT. *Per.* 29,2.

F 6 confirms S.'s reputation as a scandalmonger. It is significant that the name of the Arcadian woman and that of her father are missing in S. Besides, the name of the town "Kleitor", as pronounced in later Greek, sounds like an allusion to the clitoris, a similarity which provided the contemporary comic poets with a good lead for many jokes. It is more probable to take it *sensu obscoeno* than in a strictly geographical sense[65]. A joke in a comedy may be the ultimate source for S.'s less than flattering version of the origin of the mother of Kimon's sons. But the question again arises as to whether there were any political reasons apart from the amusement of his readers for S. to include such slander in his work.

Plutarch is completely right to trust the testimony of the learned topographer Diodoros Periegetes instead of S.'s words on Kimon's children and their mother. Admittedly, Diodoros is a much later source than S., but he had the opportunity to study the inscriptions on the famous family graves of Kimon's clan in Attika. Moreover, there is no real contradiction between S. and Diodoros, if one does not take the remark on the woman in a strictly geographical sense. The topographer's version that Isodike was the mother of Kimon's three sons, Lakedaimonios, Eleios (Oulios) and Thettalos deserves credit[66]. Kimon deliberately chose three rare names for his sons, which sounded foreign in the circles of contemporary Athenian aristocratic families. It was an easy task for Perikles[67] or other enemies of Kimon and his sons to make fun of these names or, worse, to attack them.

(7) "But the Lacedaemonians are not people of that kind." This was perhaps Kimon's most typical and best known philolaconian saying[68]. In this way he aroused the envy and hatred of his fellow-citizens, comments Plutarch on this quotation from S. His aristocratic manners and professed philolaconism had been typical of Kimon already in the 470s and early 460s. But at that time he did not incur his fellow-citizens' envy and hatred as he did in the late 460s. From about 478 to 465 B.C. Kimon was able to balance the risks originating from his undemocratic personal behaviour with his successful foreign

---

[65] Cf. DAVIES (1971: 304) and POLL. 2,174.

[66] "Kimon's marriages and children present awkward problems of source-criticism and of fact": DAVIES (1971: 304). On Kimon's family see DAVIES (1971: 304-307) on PA 8429 XI-XIII and PICCIRILLI (1982: 278-282).

[67] PLUT. *Per.* 29,2; the passage might cautiously be dated to the 430s.

[68] Cf. PLUT. *Cim.* 16,10.

policy and his generosity to his Athenian fellow-demesmen. Plutarch[69] calls the ostracisms, by which Kimon and Themistokles were driven into exile, a typical Athenian instrument of yielding to the envy of the masses of their excellent and politically prominent fellow-citizens. But we do not know the precise opinion of the Thasian S. on the institution of ostracism.

(8-11) Fragments 8-11 (with the exception of F 10a from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*) come from Plutarch's *Life of Perikles*. As usual, Plutarch intensively studied many sources for this *vita*[70]. The sources Plutarch frequently uses in his *Perikles* are Thukydides (at least from ca. 446 B.C. to the death of Perikles in 429 B.C.), perhaps a collection of the decrees of the Athenian assembly (by Krateros?), several Attic comedies, possibly collections of famous sayings by Perikles, the *Memoirs* of Ion of Chios and, of course, S. of Thasos as one of the contemporary authors. But his overall judgement of the statesman Perikles owes its decisive features to Thukydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* and the *Dialogues* of Plato. It is evident that in his general positive assessment of Perikles' character and political career Plutarch differs from S.

Plutarch quotes S. by name in the *Perikles* as the source for a famous comparison taken from the funeral oration Perikles held in honour and in memory of those Athenians killed in the Samian War (F 9), on the real aim of a naval expedition during the Samian War (F 8) and, twice (F 10b and F 11), on the disturbed relationship between Perikles and his son Xanthippos, who even appealed to the courts against one another. There are some other passages in the *Perikles* which may also derive from S., but those have not been included in this collection, because S. is not named as Plutarch's source[71]. Plutarch refers several times to S. as an eye-witness of Perikles, but he despises and rejects his chronological and factual untrustworthiness, his sensationalism, his polemical tone and his exaggerated interest in sexual matters and

---

[69] PLUT. *Them.* 22,4-5.

[70] The sources of Plutarch's *Pericles* are discussed by MEINHARDT (1957) and STADTER (1989: LVIII-LXXXV). For a comparison between the characterization and evaluation of Perikles in Thukydides and Plutarch, see PELLING (1992: 10-40); for modern scholarly opinions on Perikles see SCHUBERT (1994) and WILL (1995); on Athenian history in general see LEWIS – BOARDMAN – DAVIES – OSTWALD (1992^2) CAH V^2.

[71] A direct comparison of PLUT. *Per.* 10,6 and 29,2 with the quotations taken from S. in PLUT. *Cim.* 14,5 = F 5 and 16,1 suggests the conclusion that the first two passages also derive from S. STADTER (1989: LXII-LXIII) proposed that PLUT. *Per.* 16,3; 26,2-4 and 28,6 may come from S. and made a useful list of "general principles for reading Plutarch".

family scandals. In that respect Plutarch lumps S. together with Idomeneus of Lampsakos, Ion of Chios and the writers of Old Comedy[72]. Every quotation from S. is balanced by a comment from Plutarch himself in such a significant way that the reader is expected to share Plutarch's indignation[73] over the picture S. had given of the famous politician, for Plutarch admired Perikles as a person, a great general and a wise politician.

(8) Stadter has recently collected the extant ancient evidence on the Athenian naval expedition during the siege of Samos[74]. According to Plutarch's report, a Phoenician (i.e. Persian) fleet was coming to the aid of the Samians, although the informal arrangements later on referred to as the "Peace of Kallias" (concluded in 449/8 B.C.) had prohibited any Persian naval operations in the vicinity of Samos. If a Persian fleet ventured to intervene militarily in the Samian War, this might have provoked a mass defection of Athenian allies (or better subjects) in the Carian district. Thus it suggested itself to the Athenian generals in command of the Samian War that they should preclude any Persian armed interference by starting themselves a naval expedition along the coast of south-east Anatolia to meet the Phoenician ships there near Kaunos, if necessary. S., however, maintained that the real aim of that naval expedition, which was led by Perikles, was to capture Cyprus. If one analyzes the relevant passages in the first book of Thukydides[75] and the fragment from S., the differences in regard to the general route of the expedition are not very significant. But Cyprus, according to S. the ultimate destination of the expedition, was too far away from Samos, the main theatre of war. It is highly implausible that a general skilled in strategy such as Perikles would have tried to capture Cyprus, as long as the Samian War had

---

[72] Cf. PLUT. *Per.* 10,7 and 13,15-16 = F 10b.

[73] For as a typical example cf. PLUT. *Per.* 13,16 = F 10b: Plutarch at once makes his dissenting opinion clear by including the whole quotation from S. in a rhetorical question.

[74] STADTER (1989: 247-248).

[75] Cf. THUK. 1,116-117 on the Samian War and in particular 1,116,1 with commentary by GOMME (1945: 352-353 and 358). COLETTI (1974-75: 106-107) translated ἐπὶ Κύπρον with "verso" or "alla volta di" Cyprus. In his view the Greek wording does not imply Perikles' intention to capture the island, but should be understood as a mere indication of the geographical direction of the naval operations. Following JACOBY and contrary to COLETTI's view (1974-75: 111-112), I regard a fragment taken from FABIUS FULGENTIUS (*FGrHist* 107 F 29 = F 12 COLETTI) on the crucifixion of Polykrates and the transportation of his corpse on a *sandapila* as spurious. Hence no conclusions on the scope of S.'s work should be based on F 29, which has not been included in this sample.

not been brought to a successful conclusion. Thus a possible explanation of F 8 is that S. wanted to question the military competence of Perikles by making him pursue such an unrealistic aim.

(9) Twice in his *Perikles* Plutarch mentions the famous Periclean *Epitaphios Logos* on the Athenian casualties in the Samian War of 440/39 B.C.[76]. F 9 is a direct quotation of a rhetorical syllogism on the "immortality" of the Athenian war dead. It shows Perikles to be a great orator who knew how to use the tricks of the new ῥητορικὴ τέχνη. It may be stressed as an interesting feature of the work under discussion that S. obviously used quotations taken from speeches which had been delivered by the famous politicians who were the subject of *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. Unfortunately we cannot know how much of the funeral oration delivered by Perikles on the Athenian casualties in the Samian War was quoted by S. Such quotations may be explained as a simple device to give his account more weight. One should, however, also bear F 9 in mind when the general character of S.'s work is under discussion. Soldiers killed in battle are often regarded in later Athenian *Funeral Orations* (by Lysias, Plato, Demosthenes and Hypereides) as having achieved immortality through the honours which their thankful fellow-citizens will pay to them in the future. Citizens who give their lives for their city are also sometimes compared with its protecting heroes. Thus Perikles' bold syllogism on the fallen soldiers and the immortal gods has its firm roots in the political ideology of *Funeral Orations*, which has been profoundly studied by Loraux[77]. The quotation hints also at the deep influence of Protagoras on Perikles[78].

---

[76] In PLUT. *Per.* 8,9 = F 9 and 28,4-7. Another verbatim quotation probably from the same *Funeral Oration* can be found in ARISTOT. *Rhet.* 1,7,34 1365a 31-33: Perikles remarked in a *Funeral Oration* that youth had been taken from the city "as if spring had been taken from the year". This impressive simile is not mentioned in the text of the Periclean *Funeral Oration* we read in Thukydides (THUK. 2,35-46). It is of course possible that the simile comes from this oration, although Thukydides does not mention it. But it is more likely that the historian would have included it in his speech, if Perikles had indeed used it in 431/30 B.C. For this reason I prefer to see it in the context of the earlier *Funeral Oration* and the context of the Samian War of 440/39 B.C.

[77] Cf. LORAUX (1981) on the funeral orations; STADTER (1989: 110) on F 9. There are also some interesting parallels between F 9 and the famous Periclean speech in Thukydides, cf. especially THUK. 2,42-43.

[78] Cf. PROTAGORAS, *On the Gods* (80 A 1 and 80 B 4 DK) and TSAKMAKIS (1995: 147-148).

(10a) This is the only fragment coming from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*[79]. Athenaios' commentary on S. as a contemporary eye-witness of Perikles is more important than the contents of the fragment itself. The passage gives the correct title of S.'s work. This title *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* was given by S. himself or based on the wording of the opening sentence of his work which regularly served as a substitute for a formal book-title in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., as Jacoby thought[80].

S. told his readers that Perikles was immoderately fond of having sex with women and that he went so far as to have intercourse with his son's wife (F 10a/b and 11)[81]. Smutty jokes in contemporary comedies about Perikles and Aspasia[82], about his relationship with his son Xanthippos and the envy of his political enemies were the source of such stories, which are related about many outstanding Athenian politicians. S. even claimed that the slanderous charge concerning his wife and his father Perikles was blazed abroad in public by Xanthippos himself (see below F 11).

(10b) Plutarch is full of contempt for the scandalous stories about the sexual life and family feuds in Perikles' household that were related by S. and alluded to by the writers of comedy. The entire passage *Per.* 13,15-16 has been printed—that is, the accusations Plutarch raises against the writers of comedy, the quotation from S. itself and the methodological remark on the writing of contemporary and ancient history—in order to give the reader the opportunity to assess the quotation from S. adequately.

To quote Plutarch's comment one might expect the writers of comedy to "offer up sacrifices of contumelious abuse of their superiors to the evil deity of popular envy", because these writers themselves were

---

[79] ATHEN. 13,589d-e; on Athenaios' knowledge of authors from the fifth century B.C., see ZECCHINI (1989: 252-253); ZECCHINI (1989: 198 and 203) and TSAKMAKIS (1995: 139) do not give convincing reasons for their doubts that Athenaios may have consulted S.'s work and for assigning the whole passage ATHEN. 13,589d-590a to KLEARCHOS (see F 30 WEHRLI III = ATHEN. 13,589d). Athenaios knew other rare Greek prose writers, too. If, however, Athenaios had read S. first-hand, he perhaps would have referred to him more often in his 13th book.

[80] Cf. JACOBY's commentary on S. (II B, p. 344). The title should not be explained as the result of later interpolations or of additions to an unknown shorter original title, as e.g. COLETTI (1974-75: 70-73) suspected.

[81] Cf. also COLETTI (1974-75: 109-111).

[82] On Perikles and Aspasia cf. also ANTISTHENES *FGrHist* IV A 1 1004 F 6-8 with further literature.

men of wanton life or bad character and because their genre and the mass of their audience expected such jokes and characteristic anecdotes. In this respect these authors may even be (partly) excused by Plutarch for their unjust insinuations against Perikles, who was in Plutarch's judgement a sober and self-controlled statesman. S. is criticized with even greater severity than the writers of comedy. The Thasian may not be excused by the literary genre of his work and the expectations of his readers. Plutarch accordingly thought certain vocabulary or certain themes to be improper for the literary genres of biography, history and even contemporary political treatises. Only the bad character and the envy of S. himself are to be blamed for his unfounded charges of abounding wantonness against Perikles, for which Plutarch gives the same example as Athenaios, namely, his alleged intercourse with his son's wife. But Plutarch calls this charge "a dreadful and fabulous act of impiety". His vocabulary in the context and his commentaries on S.'s fragments (F 10b and 11) are filled with indignation[83]. Although the way S. characterized Perikles was in sharp contrast to the idealizing opinion which Plutarch himself held of this statesman, the biographer uses F 10b as his starting-point for a methodological commentary. In the late 1st and early 2nd centuries A.D. it had become a historical commonplace used by writers of biographies and histories alike that historical truth was hard to reach by means of research, that writers who lived considerably later than the events or the persons described in their works were hindered in their investigations by the lapse of time, but that contemporaries often distorted the truth due to envy and hatred or fawning flattery. These remarks go back only in part to Thukydides' famous chapter on methodology (Thuk. 1,22), but Plutarch's readers would have understood the educated allusion.

The biographer is led to this historiographical remark by his indignation over a quotation from S.'s *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. This fact must be stressed. Perhaps some conclusions may be drawn regarding the question, as to which literary genre in Plutarch's view S.'s work belonged to. It would be incorrect to conclude that Plutarch regarded S.'s work as a contemporary history (ἡλικιῶτις ἱστορία), but his commentary implies that he indeed held the opinion that the basic rules for contemporary histories also held for a work like *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*. Meister[84], however, is clearly wrong in

[83] Cf. Stadter (1989: 177-181).
[84] Cf. Meister (1978: 274-294).

taking Plutarch's general remark on the τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν βίων ἡλικιῶτις ἱστορία - or at least the latter part of it—as a precise description of the literary genre of S.'s work and as a passage which could demonstrate his opinion that S. indeed wrote an early example of Greek biography as correct.

(11) According to Plutarch, Perikles was irreproachable in his management of public funds as well as in the financial administration of his private fortune[85]. It may be helpful to the reader to give in F 11 the full text of the passus where S. is cited, with the intention of making clear how the quotation is embedded in the context. Jacoby himself had already assigned the whole *narratio* of the feud and the law-case[86] between Perikles and his son Xanthippos in Plut. *Per.* 36,1-6 to S. But since Plut. *Per.* 36,1-5 does not constitute a *verbatim* quotation from S. it is difficult to judge how deeply the present text is influenced by Plutarch's own wording and style. Hence we cannot be sure that the passage gives us a true picture of S.'s style, although it is presumably the longest preserved continuous extract from his work and must therefore be studied in detail. The main difference between the original version of S. and our present text in Plutarch's *Life of Perikles* probably is a radical shift in the sympathies of the respective writers for the main persons in the feud: whereas S. used the story to illustrate that the quarrel of the young Xanthippos with his father had not been settled at the time Perikles and Xanthippos died (in the Athenian plague as we learn from Plutarch's comment) and, thus, presumably presented both father and son in an unfavourable light, Plutarch's sympathies are clearly only with the father Perikles. One might, moreover, expect the original version of S. to have been at least as detailed or even more comprehensive than the present text of Plutarch. If this assumption is correct, it tells us something about the general character of S.'s work.

Summing up the impression one gets from fragments 8-11, S. was greatly interested in anecdotes illustrating Perikles' domestic troubles and character, but did not care much for evaluating his place in Athenian politics from a historian's point of view or in terms of the contemporary political debate in the Periclean era. Because of the

---

[85] Cf. Plut. *Per.* 16,3 and the long passage *Per.* 36,1-6 = F 11; other relevant passages can be found in Meinhardt (1957).

[86] For ancient parallels bearing witness to this feud and on the legal form of procedure, see Stadter (1989: 325-328).

fragmentary condition in which *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles* has been preserved, one must be cautious about making general statements, but S.'s attested accusations against Perikles can nevertheless be said not to stem from fundamental political disagreement.

Johannes Engels

Text editions and translations

M. Chambers, *Aristoteles. Staat der Athener* (Aristoteles Werke 10,1), Berlin 1990.

E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), I[3] Leipzig 1949-1952 and II[2], Leipzig 1942.

R. Flacelière – E. Chambry, *Plutarque. Vies VII* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1972.

W.W. Fortenbaugh (ed.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence*, Part Two (Philosophia Antiqua 54), Leiden - New York - Köln 1992.

S. Fuscagni – B. Scardigli – B. Mugelli, *Plutarco. Vite parallele (Cimone – Lucullo)*, Milano 1989.

G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratitae Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, I-III (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1887-1890.

L. Leurini, *Ionis Chii testimonia et fragmenta* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23), Amsterdam 1992.

R. Nihard, *Platon Ion*, Liège 1958[4].

I. Scott-Kilvert, *The Rise and Fall of Athens. Nine Greek Lives by Plutarch*, London 1960.

A. von Blumenthal, *Ion von Chios. Die Reste seiner Werke*, Stuttgart - Berlin 1939.

M.L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, II, Oxford 1992[2].

F. Wimmer, *Theophrasti Eresii Opera*, III (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1862.

K. Ziegler, *Plutarchus, Vitae parallelae* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), I fasc. 1, Leipzig 1969[4] and I, fasc. 2, Leipzig 1964[3].

Secondary literature

A. Blamire, *Plutarch. Life of Kimon*, Chapel Hill - London 1989.

J. Bleicken, *Die athenische Demokratie*, Paderborn - München - Wien - Zürich 1994[2].

W. Burkert, *Der Autor von Derveni: Stesimbrotos peri teleton?*, in *ZPE* 62 (1986), p. 1-5.

E.M. Carawan, *Thucydides and Stesimbrotus on the Exile of Themistocles*, in *Historia* 38 (1989), p. 144-161.

D. Coletti, *Il valore storico dei frammenti di Stesimbroto*, in *AFLPer* 12 (1974-75), p. 61-125.
J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.
K.J. Dover, *Ion of Chios. His Place in the History of Greek Literature*, in J. Boardman – C.E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (ed.), *Chios. A Conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984*, Oxford 1986, p. 27-37 (= Dover, *The Greeks and their Legacy*, Oxford 1988, p. 1-12).
H. Frisch, *The Constitution of the Athenians. A Philological-Historical Analysis of Pseudo-Xenophon's Treatise de re publica Atheniensium*, København 1942.
F.J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary*, Princeton 1980.
A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I, Oxford 1945 (= 1971).
E.S. Gruen, *Stesimbrotus on Miltiades and Themistocles*, in *CSCA* 3 (1970), p. 91-98.
G.L. Huxley, *Ion of Chios*, in *GRBS* 6 (1965), p. 29-46.
F. Jacoby, *Some Remarks on Ion of Chios*, in *CQ* 41 (1947), p. 1-17 (= H. Bloch (ed.), F. Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur Griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, Leiden 1956, p. 144-168).
R. Klein, *Die innenpolitische Gegnerschaft gegen Perikles* (1976), in G. Wirth (ed.), *Perikles und seine Zeit*, Darmstadt 1979, p. 494-533.
R. Laqueur, art. *Stesimbrotos von Thasos*, in *RE* 3 A 2 (1929), col. 2463-2467.
C. Leduc, *La constitution d'Athènes attribuée à Xénophon, traduction et commentaire*, Paris 1976.
R. Lenardon, *The Saga of Themistocles*, London 1978.
L. Leurini, *Nuovi frammenti di Ione di Chio dal Lessico di Fozio*, in *SFIC* III ser. II (= 77) (1984), p. 156-173.
D.M. Lewis – J. Boardman – J.K. Davies – M. Ostwald (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, V. *The Fifth Century B.C.*, Cambridge 1992².
N. Loraux, *L'Invention d'Athènes. Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la Cité classique*, Paris 1981.
E. Meinhardt, *Perikles bei Plutarch*, Diss. Frankfurt am Main 1957.
K. Meister, *Stesimbrotos' Schrift über die athenischen Staatsmänner und ihre historische Bedeutung (FGrHist 107 F 1-11)*, in *Historia* 27 (1978), p. 274-294.
H.D. Meyer, *Thukydides Melesiou und die oligarchische Opposition gegen Perikles*, in *Historia* 16 (1967), p. 141-154.
A. Osley, *Greek Biography before Plutarch*, in *G&R* 15 (1946), p. 7-20.
C.B.R. Pelling, *Plutarch's Adaptation of his Source-material*, in *JHS* 100 (1980), p. 127-140.
C.B.R. Pelling, *Plutarch and Thucydides*, in Ph.A. Stadter (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, London - New York 1992, p. 10-40.
L. Piccirilli, *Temistocle, Aristide, Cimone, Tucidide di Melesia fra politica e propaganda,* Genova 1987.
L. Piccirilli, *ΓΥΝΗ ΚΛΕΙΤΟΡΙΑ, ΚΛΙΤΟΡΙΑ, ΑΛΙΤΗΡΙΑ moglie di Cimone?*, in RFIC 110 (1982), p. 278-282.
A. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles. A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence*, Montreal - London 1975.
A.J. Podlecki – S. Duane, *A Survey of Work on Plutarch's Greek Lives, 1951-1988*, in *ANRW* II 33.6, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 4053-4127.
A.E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1949.

P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981.
N.J. Richardson, *Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists*, in *PCPS* 201, n.s. 21 (1975), p. 65-81.
D.A. Russell, *Plutarch*, London 1973.
F. Schachermeyr, *Stesimbrotos und seine Schrift über die Staatsmänner*, Wien 1965, p. 1-23 (= Schachermeyr, *Forschungen und Betrachtungen zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte*, Wien 1974, p. 151-171).
C. Schubert, *Perikles*, Darmstadt 1994.
P.A. Stadter, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*, Chapel Hill - London 1989.
P.A. Stadter, *Introduction*, in Id. (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, London - New York 1992, p. 1-9.
H. Strasburger, *Aus den Anfängen der griechischen Memoirenkunst. Ion von Chios und Stesimbrotos von Thasos*, in W. Schlink – M. Sperlich (ed.), *Forma et subtilitas. Festschrift für Wolfgang Schöne zum 75. Geb.*, Berlin - New York 1986, p. 1-11 (= Strasburger, *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, ed. by W. Schmitthenner – R. Zoepffel, III, Hildesheim - New York 1990, p. 341-351).
M. Treu, art. *Ps.-Xenophon πολιτεία 'Αθηναίων (de re publica Atheniensium)*, in *RE* 9 A 2 (1967), col. 1928-1982.
A. Tsakmakis, *Das historische Werk des Stesimbrotos von Thasos*, in *Historia* 44 (1995), p. 129-152.
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Thukydideslegende*, in *Hermes* 12 (1877), p. 326-367.
M.L. West, *Ion of Chios*, in *BICS* 32 (1985), p.71-78.
W. Will, *Perikles*, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1995.
G. Zecchini, *La cultura storica di Ateneo*, Milano 1989.

1003. [Timaios of Lokroi Epizephyrioi]

T

1 *Suda* T 601 *s.v.* Τίμαιος· Λοκρός, φιλόσοφος Πυθαγόρειος. Μαθηματικά, Περὶ φύσεως, Περὶ τοῦ Πυθαγόρου βίου.

---

1 Μαθηματικά : Μαθητικά *AV*

1003. [Timaios of Lokroi Epizephyrioi]

T

1 Timaios of Lokroi, a Pythagorean philosopher. He wrote *Mathematical Sciences*; *On Nature*; *On the Life of Pythagoras*.

1003. [Timaios of Lokroi Epizephyrioi]

T

(1) Whereas the ancients had no trouble in accepting the titular hero of Plato's *Timaeus Locrus* as a historical person, the existence of a real Timaios of Lokroi is categorically denied by modern scholarship: he is considered a fictional figure, invented for the sake of the argument the author intended to develop. It is true that subsequent biographical tradition—which is reasonably extensive and actually contains some very specific data—can easily and integrally be traced back to indications (both explicit and implicit) contained in Plato's dialogue[1]. Moreover, the treatise *On the Nature of the World and the Soul* (Περὶ φύσιος κόσμω καὶ ψυχᾶς) which circulated in later antiquity under the name of Timaios of Lokroi and which purports to be the original fifth-century (B.C.) source of Plato's *Timaeus*, has been proven beyond doubt to be a forgery dating from the late first century B.C. or the first century A.D., contrived to present Plato as a link in the Pythagorean *diadoche*[2].

---

[1] In addition to the explicit 'biographical' notices in PLAT. *Tim.* 20a (where Timaios is introduced as a prominent citizen of his home town who excelled in all branches of philosophy) and 27a (where reference is made to his outstanding capacities as an astronomer and his interest in natural philosophy), it can be inferred from the text that Plato regarded Timaios as an authority on Pythagorean doctrine; every piece of information given about the life of this figure in later (especially Neoplatonic) tradition—the relevant 'testimonies' are collected under no. 49 in DIELS – KRANZ and by MARG (1972: 83-87)—can clearly be shown to be rooted in this basis. There is one element that would seem to be independent of the Platonic dialogue: at § 178 of the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De mirabilibus auscultationibus* an anecdote is recounted about a pupil of Timaios of Lokroi by the name of Demaratos. Its contents and context, however, are highly suspect and hardly deserve credence. Firstly, the story lacks any support in preceding tradition, for the Demaratos in question is otherwise unknown. Secondly, the anecdote comes at the end of the concluding section § 152-178 of *On Wonderful Things Heard*, which was added to the main body of the paradoxographical work between the third and fifth centuries A.D.: see MORAUX (1951: 260). On the issue of Timaios' historicity, see HARDER (1935: 1203-1204); CORNFORD (1937: 2-3); MARG (1972: 83-85); DÖRRIE (1975: 834).

[2] See HARDER (1935: 1203-1226); MARG (1972: 87-88); BALTES (1972: 1-3); DÖRRIE (1975: 834-835); CENTRONE (1982: 296 n. 4 on 296-299); TOBIN (1985: 1-28). The forgery can be connected with the tradition, going back at least to the early third century B.C., that Plato had plagiarized a Pythagorean writing for the composition of the *Timaeus*; on this, see BURKERT (1972: 226-227); WEHRLI Suppl. I (1974: 70); SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 170-171); HUFFMAN (1993: 4-5; 12-13) and the forthcoming commentary on HERMIPPOS OF SMYRNA 1026 F 69 in *FGrHist* IV A 3.

Regardless even of the unhistorical nature of the persona Timaios of Lokroi, the possibility that a late fifth- or early fourth-century Pythagorean wrote a work *On the Life of Pythagoras* has nothing to recommend itself. Admittedly, miraculous stories about Pythagoras must have been current already in pre-Aristotelian times[3], but genuine biographical tradition about the Samian Sage is agreed to start with Aristoxenos of Tarentum. The latter is the earliest known author to be securely credited with a *Life of Pythagoras* (or *On Pythagoras and his Followers*), as well as a collection of *Pythagorean Sayings* and a work *On the Pythagorean Way of Life*, and it is quite implausible that this Pythagorean-turned-Peripatetic who, after having failed to succeed Aristotle as the head of the school, reverted to his first leanings, was the first to pick up the thread woven by a predecessor living a full century prior to him[4].

Exactly how the information about the work *On the Life of Pythagoras* came to be included in the *Suda*-article under discussion can no longer be devined, but the problem is not a grave one. It cannot be ruled out that some Neo-Pythagorean or Neoplatonist philosopher felt it incumbent upon him to write a life of the great master and to pass if off as the work of the Timaios quoted by Plato, like the author of the "source-text" of the *Timaeus*-dialogue.

Another possibility is simply to postulate a mistake on the part of the author of the *Suda*-lexicon, which is not otherwise known as a source that inspires much confidence. Indeed, as Marg[5] already suspected, it is perfectly conceivable that a work *On the Life of Pythagoras* was erroneously attributed to "Timaios of Lokroi" due, for instance, to some confusion with the historiographer Timaios of Tauromenion, who dealt at great length with Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans in the ninth book of his history of the Greeks in the West[6], just as the inclusion of the title *Mathematical Sciences* (Μαθηματικά) is probably the

---

[3] Cf. *infra*, commentary on ANDRON OF EPHESOS *FGrHist* 1005 F 3, p. 146-147.

[4] On the origins of biographical tradition about Pythagoras, see the forthcoming commentary on the F of Aristoxenos in *FGrHist* IV A 2 (no. 1016), as well as BURKERT (1972: 97-109); DILLON – HERSHBELL (1991: 6-14).

[5] MARG (1972: 85).

[6] It is an established fact that Timaios, being a Sicilian historian, had a special interest in the Pythagoreans in general (their political and social influence), and accordingly he must have devoted a great deal of attention to Pythagoras: cf. *FGrHist* 566 F 13-14, 16-17, 131-132, and see BROWN (1958: 50-51); BURKERT (1972: 103-105); PEARSON (1987: 113-118); VATTUONE (1991: 210-227).

result of a confusion of Locrian Timaios with the homonymous astronomer who was known, for instance, to Pliny the Elder[7].

Jan BOLLANSÉE

Text editions and translations

*A. ADLER (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon* IV (Lexicographi Graeci 1), Leipzig 1935 (= Stuttgart 1971).

F.M. CORNFORD, *Plato's Cosmology. The* Timaeus *of Plato Translated with a Running Commentary* (International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method), London - Henley 1937 (= 1977).

J. DILLON – J. HERSHBELL, Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life. Text, Translation and Notes* (Texts and Translations 29. Graeco-Roman Religion Series 11), Atlanta 1991.

W. MARG, Timaeus Locrus, *De natura mundi et animae. Überlieferung, Testimonia, Text und Übersetzung. Editio maior* (Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Monographs on Ancient Philosophy 24), Leiden 1972.

T.H. TOBIN, Timaios of Locri, *On the Nature of the World and the Soul. Text, Translation and Notes* (Texts and Translations 26. Graeco-Roman Religion Series 8), Chico 1985.

F. WEHRLI, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Suppl. I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel - Stuttgart 1974.

Secondary literature

M. BALTES, Timaios Lokros, *Über die Natur des Kosmos und der Seele*, Leiden 1972.

T.S. BROWN, *Timaeus of Tauromenium*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1958.

W. BURKERT, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism. Translated by E.L. MINAR, Jr.*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1972.

B. CENTRONE, *La cosmologia di Pseudo Timeo di Locri ed il* Timeo *di Platone*, in *Elenchos* 3 (1982), p. 293-324.

H. DÖRRIE, art. *Timaios* (2), in *DKP* 5 (1975), col. 834-835.

R. HARDER, art. *Timaios* (4), in *RE* 6A,1 (1936), col. 1203-1226.

C.A. HUFFMAN, *Philolaus of Croton, Pythagorean and Presocratic. A Commentary on the Fragments and Testimonia with Interpretative Essays*, Cambridge 1993.

W. KROLL, art. *Timaios* (9), in *RE* 6 A 1 (1936), col. 1228.

P. MORAUX, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote*, Leuven 1951.

---

[7] On this astronomer called Timaios (no ethnic or patronymic known), see KROLL (1936: 1228).

L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and his Predecessors*, Atlanta 1987.
A. Swift Riginos, *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden 1976.
R. Vattuone, *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio*, Bologna 1991.

1004. Antisthenes of Athens
(c. 445–365 B.C.)

T

1 (= F 1 Decleva Caizzi = V A 41 Giannantoni): Diog. Laert. 6,15-18: Φέρονται δ’ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Antisthenes) συγγράμματα τόμοι δέκα· ... τόμος δεύτερος ἐν ᾧ ... Περὶ δικαιοσύνης και ἀνδρείας προτρεπτικὸς πρῶτος, δεύτερος, τρίτος. Περὶ Θεόγνιδος δ’, ε’ ... τόμος τρίτος ἐν ᾧ ... Περὶ νόμου ἢ περὶ πολιτείας· Περὶ νόμου ἢ περὶ καλοῦ καὶ δικαίου ... τόμος τέταρτος ἐν ᾧ Κῦρος· Ἡρακλῆς ὁ μείζων ἢ περὶ ἰσχύος· τόμος πέμπτος ἐν ᾧ Κῦρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας· Ἀσπασία ... τόμος δέκατος ἐν ᾧ Ἡρακλῆς ἢ Μίδας· Ἡρακλῆς ἢ περὶ φρονήσεως ἢ ἰσχύος· Κύρος ἢ ἐρώμενος· Κύρος ἢ κατάσκοποι· Μενέξενος ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἄρχειν· Ἀλκιβιάδης· Ἀρχέλαος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας. καὶ ταῦτα μέν ἐστιν ἃ συνέγραψεν.

2 (= F 43 Decleva Caizzi = V A 204 Giannantoni): Herodicus ap. Athen. 5,220d: Ὁ δὲ Πολιτικὸς αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Antisthenes) διάλογος ἁπάντων καταδρομὴν περιέχει τῶν Ἀθήνῃσιν δημαγωγῶν.

3 (= F 42 Decleva Caizzi = V A 203 Giannantoni): Herodicus ap. Athen. 5,220d: Ὁ δ’ Ἀρχέλαος Γοργίου τοῦ ῥήτορος, ἡ δ’ Ἀσπασία τῶν Περικλέους υἱῶν Ξανθίππου καὶ Παράλου διαβολὴν (*sc.* περιέχει). (*cf.* F 6)

4 (= F 6 Decleva Caizzi = V A 43 Giannantoni): Diog. Laert. 2,60-61: Διεβάλλετο δ’ ὁ Αἰσχίνης (VI A 22 Giannantoni) καὶ μάλιστ’ ὑπὸ Μενεδήμου (III F 4 Giannantoni) τοῦ Ἐρετριέως ὡς τοὺς πλείστους διαλόγους ὄντας Σωκράτους ὑποβάλλοιτο, λαμβάνων παρὰ Ξανθίππης· Ὧν οἱ μὲν καλούμενοι ἀκέφαλοι σφόδρ’ εἰσὶν ἐκλελυμένοι καὶ οὐκ ἐπιφαίνοντες τὴν Σωκρατικὴν εὐτονίαν· Οὓς καὶ Πεισίστρατος ὁ Ἐφέσιος ἔλεγε μὴ εἶναι Αἰσχίνου. Καὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ δὲ τοὺς πλείστους Περσαῖός φησι (F 457 *SVF* I p. 102) Πασιφῶντος εἶναι τοῦ Ἐρετρικοῦ (III C 1 Giannantoni), εἰς τοὺς Αἰσχίνου δὲ κατατάξαι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν Ἀντισθένους τόν τε μικρὸν Κῦρον καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τὸν ἐλάσσω καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἐσκευώρηται.

---

7 ἢ *codd. et edd.* : καὶ *Decleva Caizzi* **8** Κύριος *BP* : Κῦρος *F, Cobet* : Κῦρνος *coni. Winckelmann* **8** Κύριος *BP* : Κῦρος *F, Cobet*

1004. Antisthenes of Athens
(c. 445–365 B.C.)

T

1 His writings are preserved in ten volumes ... the second volume includes ... *On Justice and Courage*: a hortative work in three books. *On Theognis*, making a fourth and a fifth book ... the third volume includes: ... *On Law, or On the Constitution*; *On Law, or On Goodness and Justice* ... the fourth volume includes: *Kyros*; *The Greater Herakles, or On Strength*; the fifth includes: *Kyros, or On Kingship*; *Aspasia*; ... The tenth includes *Herakles, or Midas*; *Herakles, or On Wisdom or Strength*; *Kyros, or The Beloved*; *Kyros, or The Scouts*; *Menexenos, or On Ruling*; *Alkibiades*; *Archelaos, or On Kingship*. And this is the list of his writings.

2 His dialogue *Politikos (i.e. The Statesman)* contains a sharp denunciation of all the demagogues in Athens.

3 His *Archelaos* (*sc.* contains a sharp denunciation) of Gorgias the orator.

4 It was said maliciously—by Menedemos of Eretria in particular—that most of the dialogues which Aischines passed off as his own were really dialogues of Sokrates obtained by him from Xanthippe. Those of them which are said to have no beginning are very slovenly and show none of the vigour of Sokrates; Peisistratos of Ephesos even denied that they were written by Aischines. Persaios indeed attributes the majority of the seven to Pasiphon of the school of Eretria who inserted them among the dialogues of Aischines. Moreover, Aischines made use of the *Little Kyros*, the *Lesser Herakles* and the *Alkibiades* of Antisthenes as well as dialogues of other authors.

F

1. ΑΛΚΙΒΙΑΔΗΣ (?)
(F 1-4)

1 (= F 30 Decleva Caizzi = V A 198 Giannantoni) Satyrus (*FHG* III p. 160 F 1) ap. Athen. 12,534c: Διὸ καὶ Ἀντισθένης ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ὡς δὴ αὐτὸς αὐτόπτης γεγονὼς τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου ἰσχυρὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνδρώδη καὶ ἀπαίδευτον καὶ τολμηρὸν καὶ ὡραῖον ἐφ' ἡλικίας γενέσθαι φησίν.

2 (= F 31 Decleva Caizzi = V A 201 Giannantoni) Plut. *Alc.* 1,3: Ἀλκιβιάδου δὲ καὶ τίτθην, γένος Λάκαιναν, Ἀμύκλαν ὄνομα, καὶ Ζώπυρον παιδαγωγὸν ἴσμεν, ὧν τὸ μὲν Ἀντισθένης, τὸ δὲ Πλάτων (Plat. *Alc.* 1,122 b) ἱστόρηκε.

3a (= F 32A Decleva Caizzi = V A 199 Giannantoni) Prokl. *Comm. in Plat. Alc.* 114,14-17 (p. 51 Westerink = 114,17-22 p. 94 Segonds): Ὅτι δ' αὖ μέγας ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐγένετο καὶ καλός, δηλοῖ μὲν καὶ τὸ κοινὸν αὐτὸν ἐρώμενον καλεῖσθαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπάσης, δηλοῖ δὲ ὁ Ἀντισθένης εἰπὼν ὡς εἰ μὴ τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς, οὐκ ἄρα ἦν ὄντως καλός. **3b** (= F 32B Decleva Caizzi = V A 199 Giannantoni) Olymp. *Comm. Plat. Alc.* 28,18-25 p. 20-21 Westerink: Ὅτι γὰρ καλὸς ἦν τῷ σώματι δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ κοινὸν ἐρώμενον αὐτὸν λέγεσθαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἐκ τοῦ τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς Ἀθήνησι κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν αὐτοῦ γράφεσθαι, ἐκ τοῦ τὸν Κυνικὸν Ἀντισθένην λέγειν περὶ αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς, οὐκ ἦν ὡραῖος· περὶ οὗ φησὶν ὁ ποιητὴς βουλόμενος τὸν Νιρέα εἰς κάλλος ἐπαινέσαι

Νιρεύς, ὅς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθεν
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα (Hom. *Il.* 2,673-674).

4 (= F 33 Decleva Caizzi = V A 200 Giannantoni) Herodicus ap. Athen. 5,216b/c: Καὶ Ἀντισθένης δ' ὁ Σωκρατικὸς περὶ τῶν ἀριστείων τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι (Plat. *Criton* 52b) ἱστορεῖ. "Οὔκ ἔστιν δ' ἔτυμος ὁ[7] λόγος οὗτος (Stesich. F 11 Diehl = *PMG* F 16 = 192 from Plat. *Phaedr.* 243a)." Χαρίζεται γὰρ καὶ ὁ κύων οὗτος πολλὰ τῷ Σωκράτει· Ὅθεν

---

29 ὡς δὴ *K* : ὡς ἂν *AE* **31** ἀπαίδευτον *cf. Dudley (1937: 11 n. 2) et Höistad (1948: 76 n. 7 et 179-82)* : εὐπαίδευτον *Gulick, Dalec* **31** ἐφ' ἡλικίας πάσης *add. Kaibel, cf. Plut. Alc. 1,4* **52** ὁ *secl. Meineke*

F

1. ALKIBIADES

1 Hence also Antisthenes, the disciple of Sokrates, who had seen Alkibiades with his own eyes, affirms that he was strong, manly, uneducated, daring and beautiful as a young man.

2 (Context: The names of the mothers of some famous generals and politicians have not been recorded) while in Alkibiades' case we even know that his nurse was a Spartan woman called Amykla and that his tutor was Zopyros. The first of these details has been recorded by Antisthenes and the second by Plato.

3a That Alkibiades was a tall and handsome man is made clear from the saying that he was called the common darling of all Hellas, and Antisthenes makes it clear, too, when he says that if Achilles had not been a man like Alkibiades, he would not really have been a beautiful man. **3b** That Alkibiades had a beautiful body is clear from the saying that he was the common darling of Hellas, from the fact that the Hermai at Athens were made in his image and likeness, and from Antisthenes the Cynic, who stated in regard to Alkibiades: "If Achilles had not been a man like Alkibiades, he would not really have been a beautiful man;" when he wanted to praise the beauty of Nireus, the Poet said about him (Achilles):

"Nireus, who was the most handsome man to come to
Troy of all Danaeans,
second only to the excellent son of Peleus".

4 And Antisthenes, the disciple of Sokrates, tells the same story about the prize for the bravest as Plato. "But this tale is not true". For this Cynic, as well as Plato, displays favouritism toward Sokrates in many ways; consequently neither of them should be trusted by those who judge by

οὐδετέρῳ αὐτῶν δεῖ πιστεύειν σκοπὸν ἔχοντας Θουκυδίδην. Ὁ γὰρ Ἀντισθένης καὶ προσεπάγει τῇ ψευδογραφίᾳ λέγων οὕτως· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀκούομεν κἂν τῇ πρὸς Βοιωτοὺς μάχῃ τὰ ἀριστεῖά σε λαβεῖν. - Εὐφήμει ὦ ξένε· Ἀλκιβιάδου τὸ γέρας, οὐκ ἐμόν. - Σοῦ γε δόντος, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν.

2. ΚΥΡΟΣ Η ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ
(F 5a/b)

5a (= F 29A Decleva Caizzi = V A 141 Giannantoni) Herodicus ap. Athen. 5,220c: Ἀντισθένης δ' ἐν θατέρῳ τῶν Κύρων κακολογῶν Ἀλκιβιάδην καὶ παράνομον εἶναι λέγει καὶ εἰς γυναῖκας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλλην δίαιταν. Συνεῖναι γάρ φησιν αὐτὸν καὶ μητρὶ καὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ ἀδελφῇ, ὡς Πέρσας. **5b** (= F 29B Decleva Caizzi = V A 141 Giannantoni) Eusth. *Comm. Hom. Od.* 10,7 p. 363 Stallbaum: Ἀλκιβιάδην μέντοι παρεξηυλημένον ἐν τῷ ἄλλως βιοῦν ἐξωλέστερον, ἔσκωψέ φησιν Ἀντισθένης παράνομον εἶναι καὶ εἰς γυναῖκας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλλην δίαιταν· συνεῖναι γάρ καὶ μητρὶ καὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ ἀδελφῇ ὡς Πέρσας.

3. ΑΣΠΑΣΙΑ
(F 6-8)

6 (= F 34 Decleva Caizzi = V A 142 Giannantoni) Athen. 5,220d: Ἡ δ' Ἀσπασία τῶν Περικλέους υἱῶν Ξανθίππου καὶ Παράλου διαβολήν (*sc.* περιέχει). Τούτων γὰρ τὸν μὲν Ἀρχεστράτου φησὶν εἶναι συμβιωτὴν τοῦ παραπλήσια ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν μικρῶν οἰκημάτων ἐργαζομένου, τὸν δ' Εὐφήμου συνήθη καὶ γνώριμον τοῦ φορτικὰ σκώπτοντος καὶ ψυχρὰ τοὺς συναντῶντας.

7a (= F 35 Decleva Caizzi = V A 143 Giannantoni) Athen. 13,589e: Ἀντισθένης δ' ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἐρασθέντα φησὶν αὐτὸν (*sc.* Perikles) Ἀσπασίας δὶς τῆς ἡμέρας εἰσιόντα καὶ ἐξιόντα ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀσπάζεσθαι τὴν

---

55 οὐδετέρῳ : οὐδὲ ἑτέρῳ *A* **61** Κύρων : κυρῶν *A* **62** λέγει *C* : λέγων *A* : *fort.* λέγων ... δίαιταν συνεῖναι (γάρ) φησιν *Kaibel* **63** ὡς : ὡς τοὺς *C* **72** μικρῶν *fort. delendum putat Kaibel* : μιαρῶν *corr. Casaubonus, quem secutus est Mullach* **75** Ἀντισθένης : Αἰσχίνης *coni. Jacobs, quem secutus est Winkelmann* : *sed contra Krauss (1911: 48)* **76** *fort.* ἀσπάζεσθαι <καὶ καταφιλεῖν> *Kaibel*

Thucydidean standards (*sc.* of ascertaining truth). Antisthenes, in fact, even adds the following to the unreliable account: "We hear that in the battle with the Boeotians, also, You won the prize for the bravest.—Hush, stranger!—that glory belongs to Alkibiades, not to me.—Yes, for You gave it to him, as we hear."

2. KYROS OR ON KINGSHIP

5a Antisthenes, too, in his second treatise *Kyros* abuses Alkibiades and says that he was perverted in his relationship with women as well as in his general behaviour. He even says that Alkibiades had sexual intercourse with his mother, his daughter, and his sister, as the Persians do. **5b** Antisthenes scoffed at Alkibiades describing him as a completely rotten and debauched person and he said that Alkibiades was perverted in his relationship with women as well as in his general behaviour. For he even had sexual intercourse with his mother, his daughter and his sister, as the Persians do.

3. ASPASIA

6 The dialogue *Aspasia* contains slander against Xanthippos and Paralos, the sons of Perikles. One of them, he (*sc.* Antisthenes) says, lived with Archestratos, who plied a trade similar to that of women in the cheaper brothels; the other was the boon companion of Euphemos, who used to make vulgar and heartless jokes at the expense of all whom he met.

7a Antisthenes the Socratic says that when in love with Aspasia he (*sc.* Perikles) would go in and out of her house twice a day to greet the wench (with a kiss). Once, when she was prosecuted on a charge of impiety, he,

ἄνθρωπον, καὶ φευγούσης ποτὲ αὐτῆς γραφὴν ἀσεβείας λέγων ὑπερ αὐτῆς πλείονα ἐδάκρυσεν ἢ ὅτε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκινδύνευε. Καὶ Κίμωνος δ' Ἐλπινίκῃ τῇ ἀδελφῇ παρανόμως συνόντος, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἐκδοθείσης Καλλίᾳ, καὶ φυγαδευθέντος μισθὸν ἔλαβε τῆς καθόδου αὐτοῦ ὁ Περικλῆς τὸ τῇ Ἐλπινίκῃ μιχθῆναι. **7b** (= V A 143 GIANNANTONI) PLUT. *Per.* 24,7-8: Φαίνεται μέντου μᾶλλον ἐρωτική τις ἡ τοῦ Περκλέους ἀγάπησις γενομένη πρὸς Ἀσπασίαν. Ἦν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ γυνὴ προσήκουσα μὲν κατὰ γένος, συνῳκηκυῖα δ' Ἱππονίκῳ πρότερον, ἐξ οὗ Καλλίαν ἔτεκε τὸν πλούσιον· ἔτεκε τὲ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Περικλεῖ Ξάνθιππον καὶ Πάραλον. Εἶτα τῆς συμβιώσεως οὐκ οὔσης αὐτοῖς ἀρεστῆς, ἐκείνην μὲν ἑτέρῳ βουλομένην συνεξέδωκεν, αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν ἔστερξε διαφερόντως. Καὶ γὰρ ἐξιών, ὥς φασι, καὶ εἰσιὼν ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἠσπάζετο καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτὴν μετὰ τοῦ καταφιλεῖν. **7c** (= V A 144 GIANNANTONI) HERAKLEID. PONT. ΠΕΡΙ ΗΔΟΝΗΣ (HERAKLEIDES F 59 WEHRLI VII) ap. ATHEN. 12,533c-d: Περικλέα δὲ τὸν Ὀλύμπιόν φησιν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἡδονῆς ὡς ἀπήλλαξεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν μεθ' ἡδονῆς βίον προείλετο ᾤκει τε μετ' Ἀσπασίας τῆς ἐκ Μεγάρων ἑταίρας καὶ τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῆς οὐσίας εἰς ταύτην κατανάλωσε.

4. ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΣ ΔΙΑΛΟΓΟΣ

(*cf.* T 2)

---

5. ΑΡΧΕΛΑΟΣ

(*cf.* T 3)

---

78 πλείονα : πλείω *E* **78** ἐκινδύνευε *corr. E* : ἐκινδύνευσε *A* **79** *fort.* τῇ ὕστερον ἐκδοθείσῃ Κάλλιᾳ *Kaibel* **92** μέρος *om. E*

while pleading on her behalf, wept more tears than when his life and property were endangered. Again, when Kimon consorted unlawfully with his sister Elpinike and she was later given in marriage to Kallias, after Kimon had been sent into exile, Perikles took as the price of Kimon's restoration the privilege of having intercourse with Elpinike. **7b** However, Perikles' attachment to Aspasia seems to have been a more passionate affair. His own wife was closely related to him: she had been married first of all to Hipponikos, to whom she bore Kallias, who was nicknamed "the rich", and her children by Perikles were Xanthippos and Paralos. Afterwards, when they found each other incompatible, Perikles legally handed her over to another man with her own consent and himself lived with Aspasia, whom he loved dearly. The story goes that every day, when he went out to the market-place and returned, he greeted her with a kiss. **7c** As for the Olympian Perikles, Herakleides of Pontos in his work *On Pleasure* says that he dismissed his wife from his house and preferred a life of pleasure; and so he lived with Aspasia, the courtesan from Megara, and squandered the greater part of his property on her.

4. THE STATESMAN
(*cf.* T 2)

5. ARCHELAOS OR ON KINGSHIP
(*cf.* T 3)

1004. Antisthenes of Athens

(c. 445–365 B.C.)

Introduction

In spite of his prominent role as a famous intellectual of the late 5th and first half of the 4th centuries B.C., as a radical disciple of Sokrates and a prolific writer, we do not know either the exact year of birth or of death of Antisthenes, son of Antisthenes of Athens. Unfortunately, some pieces of ancient information on his life are not reliable. Often texts are anecdotal in nature and suffer from distortions produced by different traditions in the rival philosophical schools of the Hellenistic period. Decleva Caizzi[1] and Giannantoni[2] have collected the fragments and testimonies on A.'s life, his sayings and his writings. In many respects the rich Cynic anecdotal tradition on the biography and sayings of A., who was even regarded by some later writers as the founding-father of their philosophical school of thought, cannot be trusted, because it is impossible for us to separate fiction from historical facts concerning his life. Thus the majority of anecdotal texts concerning "*de Antisthenis patria et parentibus*" (V A 1-6 GIANNANTONI), "*de Antisthene Graecos et praecipue Athenienses increpante*" (V A 7-10 GIANNANTONI), "*de Antisthene Gorgiae sophistae sectatore*" (V A 11 GIANNANTONI), "*de Antisthene Socratis discipulo*" (V A 12-21 GIANNANTONI), "*de Antisthene cynicae sectae conditore*" (V A 22-26 GIANNANTONI), "*de ratione inter Antisthenem et Platonem intercedente*" (V A 27-31 GIANNANTONI), "*de usu inter Antisthenem et Dionysium intercedente*" (V A 32 GIANNANTONI), "*de Aristippo Cyrenaico Antisthenem exagitante*" (V A 33 = IV A 19 GIANNANTONI), "*de Diogene Sinopeo Antisthenis sectatore*" (V A 34 = V B 17-24 GIANNANTONI), "*de Antisthenis exitu*" (V A 35-40 GIANNANTONI) and "*de Antisthenis scriptis*" (V A 41-52 GIANNANTONI) have not been reprinted in this collection, and the reader is referred to the relevant sections in Giannantoni's collection.

---

[1] DECLEVA CAIZZI (1966) F 122a-144.

[2] GIANNANTONI II (1990: 137-225): V A 1-40 texts on A.'s life and famous sayings; V A 41 = DIOG. LAERT. 6,15-18 = F 1 DECLEVA CAIZZI = T 1 in this collection is the most comprehensive ancient list of A.'s works; cf. also Giannantoni's important remarks about problems in assigning some fragments to certain works of A. and about some titles in GIANNANTONI IV n. 25 (1990: 235-256) with some additions to his earlier remarks (1985: 213-230).

Since Müller in 1860 pleaded for 444 and 365 B.C. as the probable dates of A.'s birth and death, scholars[3] have not made any definite progress in reconstructing A.'s biography and in giving exact dates for his life span. Some facts and dates, however, seem certain. A. was older than Plato (427-347), Isokrates (436-338) and Xenophon (about 430-355) and A. was one of the earliest pupils of Sokrates, who praised A. for his bravery during a battle against the Boeotians[4] in which both men distinguished themselves. This is commonly understood to be a reference to the battle of Tanagra[5] in 426 B.C. or the equally famous battle of Delion in 424 B.C. If A. had reached the age for military service as an Athenian citizen in the mid-twenties he must have been born in the early forties or at the end of the fifties of the 5th century. We hear in the later ancient biographical tradition that A. was the son of an Athenian father and a foreign (Thracian) mother[6]. This is confirmed by testimonies deriving from several ancient writers and by sayings ascribed to A. himself which show his critical attitude to Perikles' law on citizenship promulgated in 451 B.C. and to the excessive civic pride of the Athenians. If A. was born after 451 and his mother was foreign, he must have been a metic in his early years.

Other ancient testimonies claim that A. was one of the early pupils of Gorgias the sophist, who began his professional teaching of rhetoric and civic wisdom in Athens in 427 B.C.[7]. But we cannot be sure that these testimonies are trustworthy. Patzer suspected that the tradition that A. was Gorgias' pupil may have been invented by later biographers and admirers of A.'s rhetorical skill and the splendour of the language in his dialogues[8].

---

[3] Cf. Müller (1860: 3-20); also Natorp (1894: 2538-45); Zeller II (1963: 281-282); Decleva Caizzi (1966); Patzer (1970: 16-44); a summary of the *status quaestionis* can be found in Giannantoni III n. 21 (1985: 177-183), Giannantoni IV (1990: 195-201) and Giannantoni (1993: 15-34); Rankin (1983: 219-228 and 1986: 1-27) has to be used with caution.

[4] Cf. F 4 = Herodicus ap. Athen. 5,216b/c (= F 33 Decleva Caizzi = Giannantoni V A 200).

[5] For the battle of Tanagra cf. Thuk. 3,91 with commentary in Gomme – Dover – Andrewes II (1979: 394).

[6] Cf. e.g. Diog. Laert. 6,1 and Sen. *Const.* 18,5.

[7] Cf. Giannantoni IV n. 22 (1990: 203-205) for the testimonies on Gorgias as the first teacher of Antisthenes, e.g. Diog. Laert. 6,1, and for his friendship with the famous sophists Prodikos and Hippias cf. Xen. *Symp.* 4,62-63.

[8] Cf. Patzer (1970: 246-255).

Ancient tradition agrees on A.'s further intellectual development. He became one of Sokrates' earliest pupils and soon was known as one of his most radical and devoted adherents, who is mentioned several times in Plato (*Phaidon*) and Xenophon (*Memorabilia* and *Symposion*)[9]. A. was among the few chosen disciples who were present during their master's final hours before his death in prison in 399 B.C.[10].

As a mature man and a radical Socratic A. attached great importance to independence and self-sufficiency (αὐτάρκεια) in his personal way of life, which he sought to achieve through moral virtue[11]. Soon after 399 B.C. A. himself began to give philosophical lectures in his own school, which he had opened in the Athenian Kynosarges-Gymnasion[12]. Between 399 B.C. and his death a group of pupils gathered around him who were called the "disciples of Antisthenes" (not the Cynics!) by Aristotle[13]. The latter makes a distinction between genuine Socratics, the adherents of A., and Cynics, the disciples of Diogenes of Sinope, who became A.'s most famous pupil. Following Aristotle, the majority of modern scholars doubt that A. should be viewed as the earliest Cynic philosopher and the founding-father of the Cynic school or sect, as such terms are probably misleading in A.'s case[14]. It is thought preferable to group Antisthenes with other famous pupils of Sokrates, such as Xenophon or Plato, and to regard Diogenes of Sinope as the first genuine Cynic philosopher. But A. inspired the Cynics with their notion of self-sufficiency as the highest virtue and in addition gave them an example of a simple philosophical life and of contempt for material wealth.

In his life of *Lykurgos* Plutarch relates a saying of A. on the battle of Leuktra in 371 B.C.[15] and Diodoros informs us precisely (by providing the name of the eponymous Athenian ἄρχων of that year) that in 366

---

[9] GIANNANTONI IV (1990: 205-222); cf. esp. XEN. *Symp.* 8,5; XEN. *Mem.* 3,11,17; PLAT. *Phaed.* 59b.

[10] Cf. PLAT. *Phaed.* 59b.

[11] Cf. XEN. *Symp.* 4,34-44.

[12] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 6,13.

[13] ARISTOT. *Metaph.* 7,3 1043 b 23-8.

[14] Cf. PAQUET (1988: 19-48) with a useful collection of translated testimonia and fragments on Antisthenes. DUDLEY (1937: 1-16) regarded Diogenes of Sinope as the real "founder" of the Cynics; but see HÖISTAD (1948) and ZELLER (1963: 280-281) on Antisthenes as "der Begründer des Cynismus"; the scholarly discussion on this question may be found in RANKIN (1983: 227-228 and 1986: 177-188) and in GIANNANTONI IV n. 24 (1990: 223-233 and 1993: 15-34). On the history of the Cynics, see the papers collected in GOULET-CAZÉ (1993) and BRANHAM – GOULET – CAZÉ (1996).

[15] PLUT. *Lyc.* 30,7.

B.C. A. was regarded as one of the most famous living Athenian philosophers[16]. Thus 366 B.C. is the latest attested date for A.'s life and marks the *terminus post quem* (or even a *terminus ad quem*) of his death.

A. was a prolific writer whose works illustrate his intellectual position. This position was influenced by the rhetorical tradition of the contemporary Greek sophists (especially Gorgias, Prodikos and Hippias) and by Sokrates' uncompromising personal example and philosophical doctrines. The most complete list of his attested works can be found in Diogenes Laertios[17]. Most of these works are now lost or have been preserved only in a fragmentary state. A.'s writings are a true mirror of his personality. It was noticed even by his ancient readers that some of them belonged to the rhetorical genre, while others continued the Socratic philosophical tradition[18]. A. preferred (fictitious) speeches (λόγοι), προτρεπτικοί and Socratic dialogues (διάλογοι). Although, on the basis of a passage in Theopompos[19] cited in Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*, it has been contended that A. was also one of the first writers of διατριβαί, this testimony is insufficient to furnish proof of that assumption. However, in Hellenistic and imperial Roman times this new prose genre was often used by Cynic philosophers to preach their philosophical "gospel".

No fully developed βίος or biography in the strict sense of the literary genre as it was defined some time after his death is attested for A.[20]. He used two established literary genres, namely speeches and Socratic dialogues (cf. T 4), and perhaps the recently developed genre of διατριβαί, to present different βίοι or *ways of life* to his disciples and readers. A.'s works, especially those on the Athenian demagogues, on Alkibiades, on Aspasia and Perikles, were full of anecdotes and biographical details.

---

16 DIOD. 15,76.

17 T 1 = DIOG. LAERT. 6,15-18 (= F 1 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 41); PATZER (1970: 107-163); for the lost works see MÜLLER (1860) and recently GIANNANTONI IV n. 25 (1990: 235-256).

18 Cf. e.g. HIER. *Adv. Iovin.* 2,14 (= F 128 B DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 12); PATZER (1970: 94-98).

19 ATHEN. 11,508c-d = THEOPOMPOS *FGrHist* 115 F 259 (= F 4 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 42).

20 Nonetheless it is clear from his handwritten notes that Jacoby himself intended including some testimonies and fragments of A.'s works in part IV of *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*.

Although many of A.'s works were known to the educated reader of the Roman imperial period, only two fictitious speeches in the tradition of Gorgias are extant under the titles *Aias* and *Odysseus*. But they seem to have been composed as epideictic show pieces, possibly in order to present Odysseus as a prefiguration of a Cynic hero or of attacking certain sophistic positions[21]. We are informed on a book entitled *On Theognis* (cf. T 1), and whilst there are no fragments preserved from this work, the wording in Diogenes Laertios points to the assumption that we can exclude a formal biography of the poet Theognis. *On Theognis* may have been the sub-title of books four and five of a larger moral treatise entitled *Protreptikos*: *On Justice and Courage*, which is listed immediately before by Diogenes Laertios. It is thinkable that A. borrowed some historical examples of justice and courage from Theognis' poems[22].

However, some of A.'s dialogues are of special interest for a collection of fragments on Greek biographers, as they illustrate important precursory works of biography in the strict sense of the later βίοι. A. has played a crucial role in the development of Greek biography as a prose genre[23]. Therefore I have limited myself to including testimonies and fragments from the dialogues Πολιτικὸς[24], Ἀρχέλαος[25], Ἀλκιβιάδης[26], Κῦρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας[27] and Ἀσπασία[28].

[21] Cf. GIANNATONI IV n. 26 (1990: 257-264) for a summary of the discussion on the *Aias* (= F 14 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 53) and the *Odysseus* (= F 15 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 54).

[22] For some educated guesses on the contents of A.'s *Protreptikos* and *On Theognis* see GIANNANTONI IV n. 30 (1990: 285-294, esp. 286-289). GIGANTE (1987: 208) translated the title with "*Sulla giustizia e sul coraggio.* protrettico primo, secondo, terzo; *Su Theognide* protrettico quarto e quinto"; on Theognis see also YOUNG's (1971) edition of the *Corpus Theognideum* and VON DER LAHR (1992) with literature.

[23] Cf. the judgements on the different περὶ βίων-works in LEO (1901: 97); see also STUART (1928: 123-127), DIHLE (1970^2: 69-87) and MOMIGLIANO (1993: 47-48) on A.'s role as an "original and powerful contributor" (1993: 47) to the later genre of Greek biography.

[24] F 43 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 204.

[25] F 42 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 203.

[26] GIANNANTONI V A 198-202.

[27] F 29A-33 DECLEVA CAIZZI; GIANNANTONI V A 141.

[28] F 34-35 DECLEVA CAIZZI; GIANNANTONI V A 142-143.

Commentary on testimonies and fragments

1. ALKIBIADES
(F 1-4)

(1-4) In Hellenistic times a scholarly edition of the complete works of A. was made in ten volumes at Alexandria or Pergamon. To prepare this edition the editors scrutinized many works then in circulation under A.'s name. They accepted some as genuine and rejected others as spurious. The genuine works were assigned to one of the ten volumes on the basis of thematic criteria. Some works were given a place in this edition for the first time under the same title we find later in the catalogue of Diogenes Laertios. Other titles were explained by means of subtitles pointing to the contents of the works in question, e.g. *Kyros or on Kingship*. Since A. attacked Alkibiades' perverted sexual life in one of his *Kyros*-dialogues (= F 5a/b), some editors, among them Decleva Caizzi, have assigned all fragments on Alkibiades' debauched way of life, his handsome and striking personal appearence, his physical and intellectual abilities and his courage to one of A.'s *Kyros*-dialogues[29]. It is, however, explicitly attested by Diogenes Laertios that a separate dialogue (cf. T 4) entitled *Alkibiades* was known among the writings of A.[30]. Still opinion among recent editors of A.'s fragments is divided as to whether A. in fact did write such a separate work on Alkibiades. Some scholars have regarded the works listed in the tenth book of the catalogue given by Diogenes Laertios as spurious. But another passage from Diogenes Laertios, which has been adduced to demonstrate this thesis, has been shown by Giannantoni[31] to be insufficient evidence. Thus we can accept the works listed in the tenth book of the edition known to Diogenes Laertios as genuine works of A. Giannantoni assigned one fragment on Alkibiades (see F 5a) to the first title of the fifth volume in the ten-volume edition, Κῦρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας, but the other fragments (F 1-4) to a separate dialogue (or treatise) entitled *Alkibiades*.

---

[29] Cf. Decleva Caizzi in a short commentary on F 29A-33 (1966: 97-98), but see Giannantoni IV n. 36 and n. 38 (1990: 347-354 and 384-385).

[30] Cf. also Diog. Laert. 6,18.

[31] Cf. Giannantoni IV n. 31 and n. 36 (1990: 295-308 and 347-349). Susemihl (1887: 207-210) regarded the works in the tenth book as spurious; Patzer (1970: 102-103 and 131-133) had his doubts too; but see Giannantoni IV n. 25 (1990: 236-237); de Romilly (1995: 241) has also recently distinguished a dialogue entitled *Alkibiades* from the *Kyros*-dialogues.

A. attacked Alkibiades with all his proverbial rigour. F 5a from the second *Kyros* looks like a cross-reference to the earlier *Alkibiades* and it seems a reasonable guess that it was made with a view to contrasting Kyros' way of life with that of Alkibiades. The philosopher blamed the leading demagogue for being perverted in his relationship with women and in his general way of life[32]. F 5a/b constitute fierce attacks on him, especially the accusation that he had intercourse with his own mother, daughter and sister (like the Persians, *i.e.* the barbarians). Such attacks are easily explained as stock accusations in *Old Comedy*, contemporary rhetorical topoi of denigration or a mere product of A.'s polemical interest. But Alkibiades' mocking attitude towards conventional Athenian morality and his glamorous sexual life in Athens[33], as well as during his exile in Sparta, were the talk of the town among his contemporaries. Perhaps A. also wished to criticize Alkibiades' scandalous relationship with a woman from Abydos, named Medontis, whom he is reported by Lysias to have shared as his mistress and wife with Axiochos. Medontis gave birth to a daughter who, when she was grown up, became in turn the object of Alkibiades' and Axiochos' attention: according to Lysias, whenever either of them made love to this young woman each maintained that she was the daughter of the other[34].

Among A.'s contemporaries the Athenian Xenophon is the best known Socratic to have chosen, as did A., Herakles (in the *Memorabilia*) among the Greeks and Kyros I (in the *Kyroupaideia*) among the barbarians as models of self-control and virtue (ἀρετή) achieved through constant labour (πόνος) and personal excellence[35]. In his *Kyros*-dialogues, A. compared Kyros, the ideal ruler and moral example, with Alkibiades, the most dangerous demagogue and debauched individual. By giving praise to Kyros A. developed his philosophical ideal of life and of the best type of statesman and ruler[36]. There are

---

32 Herodicus apud Athen. 5,220c (= F 29A Decleva Caizzi = Giannantoni V A 141).

33 Plut. *Alc.* 8,4-6.

34 Cf. Lys. F 4 p. 346 Thalheim = Athen. 12,534f-535a; see also Athen. 13,574d-e; Rankin (1986: 124f) and Ellis (1989: 20) discuss the sources. But the story is probably a mere invention of the orator for his own purposes.

35 Cf. Tatum (1989) and the very useful commentary by Gera (1993) with literature on the *Kyroupaideia*; on Kyros as the "good" and Xerxes as the "bad" Persian king in ancient tradition, see also Wiesehöfer (1994: 71-89 and 339-343); on Herakles, compare the famous story of the hero at the crossroads (Xen. *Mem.* 2,1,21-34).

36 Diog. Laert. 6,2 (= F 19 Decleva Caizzi = Giannantoni V A 85) amounts to a testimony on the purpose of the *Kyros*-dialogues.

only insufficient reasons for considering A.'s *Kyros* to be an early and experimental form of political biography, or—in spite of the juxtaposition of Kyros and Alkibiades—as a precursory work of Plutarch's famous *Parallel Lives*. Rather, he would seem to have conceived his work as a moral and political treatise on ideal ways of life—βίοι—with a strong biographical element[37]. Therefore it seems justifiable to include the seven fragments on Alkibiades, who typified the life of self-indulgence, in this volume which presents examples of important precursory works of Greek biography up to the death of Alexander the Great.

In comparison with other prominent politicians and intellectuals of the late 5th century, there are rich contemporary testimonies for the life of Alkibiades, son of Kleinias of the demos Skambonidai[38]. Alkibiades was one of the prominent Athenian sophists, poets, and politicians, whose lives were regarded with great interest by their contemporaries, but which were judged by them to be controversial. The late 5th and early 4th centuries were a time of cultural and political disruption as a result of the Peloponnesian war and of the teaching of the sophists in Athens. In this peculiar historical situation Alkibiades, Theramenes, Kritias and other Athenians provoked exaggerated comment on their lives[39] in a great variety of literary forms both by friend and foe. Ἐγκώμια and ψόγοι[40], real or literary-fictitious accusations and apologies or narrations of episodes in their lives included in philosophical, anecdotal or historical works laid the foundations for the earliest philosophical and political biographies. Among them Sokrates seems to have been the most important for the development of biography[41].

There are five fragments attested for A.'s *Alkibiades* and his second *Kyros* or handed down to us without indication of their exact source (F 1-5). None of them provides proof of A.'s interest in the highly controversial political career of Alkibiades. A., being a true Socratic, was

---

[37] Cf. the key words δίαιτα in Antisthenes F 1 and τὸ ἄλλως βιοῦν in F 2.

[38] On his political activity see Develin (1989) No. 84, Kirchner (1901-1903) *PA* 600, Davies (1971: 9ff), Osborne – Byrne (1994: 22) No. 23, Traill (1994) No. 121630; see also Rhodes (1985), Ellis (1989), Forde (1989), Bloedow (1990: 1-19; 1991a: 17-29; 1991b: 49-65 and 1992: 139-157), Engels (1993: 148-149), Prandi (1992: 3-21) and de Romilly (1995) with literature.

[39] Cf. Gomme – Dover – Andrewes V (1981: 287) and Dihle (1970: 41).

[40] See recently Pernot (1993) on ἐγκώμια and ψόγοι.

[41] Cf. Dihle (1970: 13-34 and 1987: 7-22, esp. 16) on "Biographie, Enkomion, Geschichtswerk im Hellenismus".

mainly interested in Alkibiades' relationship with Sokrates (F 4), his physical appearance (F 1; 3a/b), character (F 4; 5a/b) and way of life (F 1; 5a/b). Thus the development of contemporary or early remarks on Alkibiades' life confirms the general observation that in early biographical writings historical events were "selected and marshalled around the character and fortunes of the hero"[42].

(1) Satyros[43] is Athenaios' source for this information on the impressive physical appearance of Alkibiades, which is *inter alia* (e.g. in Plato's famous scenes in the *Symposion* and in his remarks in the first *Alkibiades*)[44] documented by the testimony of A., who is introduced by Satyros as an eye-witness to Alkibiades' beauty, his strong physical appearance and other qualities. The correct interpretation of F 1 depends upon the exact wording of the Greek text. If we accept ἀπαίδευτον in the third line of the text this is the only negative attribute in an otherwise laudatory series of *epitheta* on Alkibiades' physical qualities and his character. From a philosopher's point of view, for which one may compare Plato's theory of the parts of the soul in the *Phaidros* and his characterization of the guardian-dogs in the *Republic*, a daring character (τὸ τολμηρόν) is to be regarded as a positive natural gift only as long as it is constantly controlled by reason and education[45]. Now Alkibiades is unanimously presented in our best and contemporary sources as a very sophisticated Athenian who in his youth had enjoyed the best possible education in Athens. Thus the emendation εὐπαίδευτον seems to recommend itself at first sight. Gulick, for one, has accepted it and rendered the term with "cultivated". On the other hand, ἀπαίδευτον is the *lectio difficilior* and, from A.'s point of view as a Socratic philosopher, makes sense[46]. A. wanted to contrast the brilliant physical appearance of Alkibiades and his promising talents with his perverted way of life (see F 1-2), which ultimately gave proof of his lack of genuine philosophical παιδεία and ἐγκράτεια. Like Plato in his first *Alkibiades*, A. could call the sophisticated Alki-

---

42 Russell (1995: 191-207), the quotation is from p. 192; see also Russell (1973: 117-129).

43 *FHG* III, p. 160 F 1 and forthcoming *FGrHist* IV A 4.

44 Cf. T 3a/b; Plut. *Alc.* 1-2; Plat. *Symp.* 212d-214e, *Alc.* 104a; *Gorg.* 481d (on Sokrates and Alkibiades); see also Ellis (1989: 20).

45 Cf. Plat. *Phaedr.* 253e-254e; Plat. *Resp.* 375e-376d.

46 Cf. Dudley (1937: 11): "The point lies in ἀπαίδευτος." It may be remarked that ἀνάγωγος and τολμηρός were also used by Polybios in his sharp criticism of Timaios (Polyb. 12,25,6).

biades an uneducated person[47]. A second minor problem is Kaibel's addition of πάσης in the last line of the text of F 1. His wording was accepted and translated by Gulick by "beautiful at every period in his life". But Plutarch[48] and Plato[49] both stress the κάλλος of Alkibiades in his youth, and not explicitly at *every* period of his life. Therefore I propose to dispense with Kaibel's addition in our text of F 3, although the Greek ἡλικία may indeed refer to every period of life and is not limited to youth.

(2) Like Plato in his first *Alkibiades,* A. had given very detailed pieces of information on the family and youth of Alkibiades. He even mentioned the name of his Spartan nurse, Amykla, just as Plato provided the name of his tutor, Zopyros. The lineage of the hero, detailed information on his parents[50], education and friends were of great interest to all Greek biographers. In this respect, F 2 displays a biographical interest that may be said to be typical.

(3a/b) F 3a/b comment upon the famous passage in which Plato praises the physical beauty and stature of Alkibiades[51], which provoked a comparison with the heroes of the epic world. A. compared Alkibiades with Achilles. The flattering and already contemporary saying that Alkibiades was the "common darling of all Hellas" was even reported by his critics, including A. and Plato. A *Life of Alkibiades* written by Satyros may be the source of F 3b which stressed his physical beauty[52]. In Athens even the stone masons made some of their statues of *Hermai* resemble Alkibiades[53].

(4) In this fragment (cited in Athenaios) Herodikos criticized the reports by Plato[54] and other early Socratic philosophers on the military

---

[47] Cf. recently Giannantoni IV (1990: 385) on A.'s attitude towards education and science.

[48] Plut. *Alc.* 1,4-5 for his physical appearance, 1,6-8 for his voice and 2,1 for his ethos; for a comparison with other biographies and an enumeration of such topoi see Leo (1901: 180-182).

[49] Plat. *Alc.* 104a.

[50] On Alkibiades' family and predecessors see the references in n. 38; see also Pelling (1990: 213-244) on childhood and personality in Greek biography.

[51] Κάλλιστος καὶ μέγιστος (Plat. *Alc.* 104a).

[52] See Athen. 12,534b-c (= F 30 Decleva Caizzi = Giannantoni V A 198).

[53] Cf. Clem. Alex. *Protr.* IV 53,6 p. 41 Stählin and Aristainetos *Ep.* 1,11.

[54] Plat. *Criton* 52b only testifies to the well-known fact that Sokrates fulfilled his duty as a citizen-soldier in several campaigns; but cf. Plat. *Symp.* 221a und Plut. *Alc.* 7,5 (= Giannantoni V A 202) on the battles of Potideia 432/31 b.c. and Delion 424 b.c.

bravery of Sokrates and his prize for bravery. In Plutarch's *Life of Alkibiades*[55], we read that on one occasion the prize for the bravest should have been awarded to Sokrates on the justest calculation, after he and Alkibiades had distinguished themselves in a battle during the campaign of Potideia in 432/31. But when Sokrates saw that the generals were anxious to give him the prize of valour because of Alkibiades' high social position and as he wished to incite the honourable ambitions[56] of his pupil Alkibiades, he was the first to bear witness to Alkibiades' bravery and asked that the crown and the suit of armour should be given to Alkibiades in spite of his own entitlement.

But according to Herodikos those who judge the truth by the standards of Thukydides should trust neither Plato nor any of the other early Socratic philosophers, as far as military or political details of Sokrates' life are concerned. Herodikos criticizes the encomiastic traditions of Sokrates' pupils concerning their master's life. A. is attacked here for being patently biased in favour of his teacher Sokrates (and against Alkibiades). According to Herodikos, A. deliberately invented a second story of a prize for military bravery which Sokrates won in a battle in Boiotia and which again was given to Alkibiades. Furthermore, he embellished this invented story by a fictitious dialogue between a stranger and Sokrates himself, in which the latter was made to confirm this episode. Although it is an established fact that Plutarch used A. as one of his (many) sources for the *Life of Alkibiades*, it is not certain that the story of Sokrates yielding his deserved prize for bravery to Alkibiades comes from A. Plutarch gives no authority for this story[57]. F 4 may be a doublet invented by A. on the basis of another author's report on the battle of Potideia.

2. KYROS
(F 5a/b)

(5a/b) If we can rely upon the Hellenistic classification of A.'s works and if we can trust that this tradition has been reproduced faithfully by Diogenes Laertios[58], A. must have written several works on Kyros.

---

55 Plut. *Alc.* 7,5 (= Giannantoni V A 202).
56 Following Plutarch the φιλότιμον is the ambiguous key-feature of Alkibiades' character.
57 Plut. *Alc.* 7,5 (= Giannantoni V A 202).
58 Cf. Giannantoni IV n. 25 (1990: 235-256); but see Mejer (1978: 16-29) on some serious mistakes made by Diogenes, which were the result of his technique of abbreviating and excerpting from his sources.

We hear of one work in the fourth (*Kyros*) and another in the fifth volume (*Kyros or on Kingship*) and two more in the tenth and last volume, if one accepts the plausible emendation of the name Kyrios to Kyros[59]. Diogenes Laertios assigned several works on Kyros to three different books in the complete edition. This might point to a difference in thematic scope. In general, A. must have adduced king Kyros as a prominent example of personal virtue and as an ideal monarch in his *Kyros*-dialogues, whereas abstract problems relating to ethics and constitutional matters, such as the role of traditional religion and law in the *Polis*, were probably treated in the third volume, e.g. in *On Law and Constitutions*.

(5a) F 5a is the only fragment which can be identified with certainty as belonging to one of A.'s *Kyros*-dialogues. It comes from Herodikos and is taken from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*. Herodikos[60], surnamed ὁ κρατήτειος[61], came from Seleukeia on the Tigris and was one of Krates of Mallos' pupils (2nd century B.C.). Athenaios quotes extensively[62] from Herodikos' pamphlet Πρὸς τὸν φιλοσωκράτην which was directed against Plato and other Socratics (e.g. A., Aischines and Xenophon). They were accused by Herodikos of having distorted the truth about Sokrates and his pupils, e.g. Alkibiades. In F 1 Herodikos tried to defend Alkibiades against A.'s exaggerated attacks. Herodikos' (or Athenaios'?) words ἐν θατέρῳ τῶν Κυρῶν have been understood in different ways. Gulick's translation of the passage in the *Loeb Classical Library*[63] is mistaken, since he assumes that *Kyros* was a treatise on king Kyros II, while there can be no doubt that Kyros I was A.'s ideal ruler and a model of self-control among the barbarians. But the accusations against Alkibiades may have been taken from the second book of a *Kyros*-dialogue in two volumes or from the second one of two different *Kyros*-dialogues which were known to Herodikos or Athenaios. This seems to be altogether the most likely possibility.

(5b) We cannot know whether the Byzantine scholar Eustathios read the polemical accusations against Alkibiades in an epitome of Athen-

59 Cf. for A.'s *Kyros*-works GIANNANTONI V A 84-91 and V A 141 with GIANNANTONI IV n. 31 (1990: 295-308).

60 Cf. the collection of Herodikos' fragments by DÜRING (1941).

61 Cf. βαβυλώνιος in ATHEN. 5,222a.

62 In the 5th (5,215c) and 11th (11,504e) books of the *Deipnosophistai*.

63 GULICK vol. II (1957: 497) on ATHEN. 5,220c.

aios' *Deipnosophistai* (which is the most likely hypothesis)[64], or whether he still had access to either the original works of Herodikos, the source of Athenaios, or to a learned author on the works and opinions of the early Socratics, such as Persaios or Pasiphon, or even to A.'s original works.

3. ASPASIA
(F 6-7)

(6-7c) To a high degree of probability *Aspasia*[65] was not a formal biography of Aspasia's whole life (or a substantial part of it), but a Socratic or "proto-Cynic" moral treatise on the correct relationship between men and women or a political pamphlet directed against Perikles, his family and his relationship with Aspasia[66]. A.'s work *Aspasia* bears witness to Socratic hostility towards Perikles and his clan and may be understood as an attack against him which included many famous anecdotes about him. Since the work was entitled *Aspasia* (and not *Perikles*), one may assume that A. also provided many items of information on her life.

(6) A.'s *Aspasia* contained a lot of slander and worthless διαβολή, but also anecdotes pertaining to Perikles' biography. Xanthippos and Paralos, Perikles' two sons by his first, Athenian wife, are criticized for their immoral sexual practices, their companions (especially Archestratos and Euphemos) and their lack of true philosophical education, which is shown by the vulgar and heartless jokes of Paralos' friend Euphemos. Xanthippos and Paralos—as far as we know—were not attacked by A. for political reasons, e.g. as representatives of the political tradition of radical democracy or of Athens' imperial posi-

---

64 Cf. Diog. Laert. 2,61 (= F 6 Decleva Caizzi = Giannantoni V A 43); see Zecchini (1989: 10-11) on the question of whether Eustathios used an epitome of Athenaios or may have had access to an *editio maior* of the *Deipnosophistai* which had been available at the library of emperor Constantine Porphyrogennetos in the 10th century; for similar cases of fragments taken from Athenaios and Eustathios cf. Hermippos of Smyrna *FGrHist* IV A 3 1026 = F 46a Bollansée (forthcoming) = F 68a I Wehrli and Phainias of Eresos *FGrHist* IV A 1 1012 F 7 Engels = F 17a/b Wehrli.

65 F 34-35 Decleva Caizzi = Giannantoni V A 142-143; cf. also Giannantoni IV n. 33 (1990: 323-325).

66 On Aspasia's life and the tradition on her relationship with Perikles, see recently Loraux (1993: 123-154), Henry (1995: 29-56): "Aspasia and the Socratic Tradition" and Solana Duesco (1994: XI-XLI) with a useful collection of ancient testimonies concerning Aspasia's life and her alleged works (1994: 2-120).

tion in the Aegean world, which were associated by A.'s contemporaries with Perikles.

(7a-c) In the *Aspasia* A. sought to give a negative example of the ἡδονῆς βίος, the life of pleasure and self-indulgence. In the Socratic classification of ways of lives the life of pleasure was typical of a "democratic man" (and of "tyrants"). Hence Aspasia and Perikles, the heroes of the *Aspasia*, were a good choice. By relating "scandalous" anecdotes about Perikles' relationship with this courtesan and about the improper public behaviour of Elpinike, Kimon's sister, A. illustrated *e contrario* the way an Athenian and educated Greek statesman or an honourable Athenian woman should live[67]. F 7b is taken from Plutarch's *Life of Perikles* and F 7c from Herakleides Pontikos' treatise *On Pleasure*. Both texts have been included by Giannantoni in his collection, but have not been included by Decleva Caizzi in her earlier collection. In order that the reader of this collection may be able to follow the discussion on Antisthenes' role in the development of Greek biography, I have included both texts in this collection. Close parallels between the wording of the first sentence of F 7a (attested for A.) and the last sentence in 7b lead to the conclusion that 7b is also taken from A.'s *Aspasia*. But it cannot be ruled out that F 7b might equally have been taken from a homonymous work *Aspasia* by Aischines, another Socratic, who is explicitly mentioned by Plutarch as one of his sources in this very paragraph. Athenaios refers to a work by Herakleides Pontikos entitled *On Pleasure* as the source of F 7c. Herakleides himself may have borrowed this information from A.'s *Aspasia*, but several other sources (e.g. Aischines the Socratic) are also possible[68].

4. THE STATESMAN
(T 2)

(T 2) We read in the only preserved testimony to the *Statesman* that it was composed as a dialogue, and, following Patzer, "der Kontext bei Herodikos ... und Persaios .. läßt kaum einen Zweifel, daß auch die Schriften ᾿Αλκιβιάδης, ᾿Αρχέλαος, ᾿Ασπασία, Ἡρακλῆς ὁ ἐλάσσων

[67] See my commentary on STESIMBROTOS of Thasos *FGrHist* IV A 1 1002 (= *FGrHist* 107) F 10-11 for further literature on Perikles, Aspasia, Xanthippos and Paralos.

[68] See the short, but valuable commentary on HERAKLEIDES PONTIKOS F 59 WEHRLI VII (1969: 80).

und Κῦρος μικρός Dialoge gewesen sind"[69]. With Sokrates himself and most of the early Socratics A. shared a critical attitude to democracy as a system of government, and in particular to Athenian democracy and the ruling elite of ῥήτορες καὶ στρατηγοί of the late 5th and early 4th centuries. The death-sentence passed on Sokrates of course exacerbated the Socratic philosophers' prejudices against or even their feelings of hatred towards the restored democracy of 403/401 B.C., although their opposition had begun earlier and had at first been based on philosophical grounds[70]. A. regarded the Spartan κόσμος as a model for a well-ordered constitution. Many of his famous sayings—both those that are genuine as well as wittier and sharper *Apophthegmata* assigned to him in later times—bear witness to his radical criticism of democracy[71]. Similar sharp criticism of or contempt for the Athenian democrats was expressed in the Platonic dialogue *Politikos*, in Stesimbrotos of Thasos' *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*[72], a treatise written about a generation earlier, and in Theopompos of Chios' *excursus* on the Athenian demagogues in the tenth book of his *Philippika*[73], written about a generation later than A.'s *Statesman.* Even the fragmentary condition of our evidence permits the conclusion that Aspasia, Perikles, his sons and Alkibiades were A.'s favourite targets for attack[74], just as they were extensively scoffed at in contemporary comedy[75]. But he evidently did not spare other prominent Athenian demagogues: in his dialogue *Politikos* (*i.e. The Statesman*) A. attacked all Athenian demagogues, as we are told by Herodikos in a short summary of the contents of the work (T 2). No fragments have been preserved, and it is strange that the title *Politikos* is missing in our most comprehensive list of A.'s works in Diogenes Laertios, whereas Athenaios explicitly mentions it in the *Deipnosophistai,* basing himself on an earlier summary by Herodikos of Seleukeia, a grammarian of

---

69 PATZER (1970: 94).

70 Cf. GIANNANTONI IV n. 40 (1990: 403-411); on philosophers as opponents of democracy in Athens see PRESTEL (1939), WOLFF (1979: 279-302), RAAFLAUB (1992: 1-60) and ROBERTS (1994: 48-92).

71 E.g. ARISTOT. *Pol.* 3,13 1284 a 11-17 (= F 100 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 68); DIOG. LAERT. 6,5 (= F 103 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 71); DIOG. LAERT. 6,8 (= F 169 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 72) and similar texts in GIANNANTONI V A 68-78: *quid Antisthenes de legibus et de republica senserit.*

72 Cf. in this collection STESIMBROTOS *FGrHist* IV A 1 1002 = *FGrHist* 107.

73 THEOPOMPOS *FGrHist* 115 F 85-100; see also CONNOR (1968: 19-76), SHRIMPTON (1991: 127-156) and FLOWER (1994: 90-97) on A.'s influences upon Theopompos.

74 Cf. on Aspasia, Perikles and his sons F 34-35 DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 142-144 and on Alkibiades F 29A-33 DECLEVA CAIZZI and GIANNANTONI V A 198-202; see F 7a-c with lit.

75 See e.g. SCHWARZE (1971: 169-170) and KLEIN (1979: 494-533).

the second century B.C. Natorp[76] suggested that A.'s *Politikos* may correspond to the treatise entitled *On the Law or On Constitutional Matters* mentioned in Diogenes Laertios, but this cannot be confirmed. Perhaps in his work *On the Law or On Constitutional Matters* A. discussed the traditional notion of Athenian law that was proclaimed by the polis in the assembly of the people on the one hand, and his own concept of traditional and natural law, on the other, whereas in the *Statesman* he may have criticized the way of life of a typical contemporary Athenian orator. He probably found fault with this βίος or way of life and gave a series of biographical examples taken from the lives of leading Athenian demagogues. It is also possible that A. gave descriptions of other types of politician such as the oligarch, the timocrat, the monarchic ruler and the tyrant.

One is inclined to presume that *The Statesman* was a mixture of political and philosophical criticism of democracy and democratic man, biographical sketches and personal attacks on leading demagogues, as we find in the fragments of A.'s dialogues *Kyros* and *Aspasia*. One of A.'s most famous sayings, μείζων ἐς κόρακας ἢ ἐς κόλακας (better be thrown to the crows than the sneaks and flatterers; where in imprecations the phrase ἐς κόρακας also has the popular meaning of "go and be hanged")[77], shows his contempt for Athenian demagogues whom he attacked as κόλακες, flatterers of the people. Given the fragmentary condition of our tradition on *The Statesman* it would be hazardous to claim that this work was an early example of a collective political biography. Most probably, it was a radical Socratic dialogue or treatise on statesmanship in which A. used biographical material to illustrate his general position. Perhaps A.'s *Statesman* was intended to correspond to Plato's *Politikos*. Despite these reservations concerning the literary genre of *The Statesman*, the work deserves a place in this collection of fragments of Greek biographies as a literary root of the developed collections of biographies of Hellenistic times.

5. ARCHELAOS OR ON KINGSHIP (T 3)

(T 3) Only one testimony of *Archelaos or on Kingship* has been preserved in Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*. It says that this work included a διαβολή

---

[76] NATORP (1894: 2542).

[77] Cf. F 84A and B DECLEVA CAIZZI = GIANNANTONI V A 131 with parallel sources for similar apophthegmata ascribed to Diogenes or Demosthenes.

on Gorgias. If we could trust our ancient testimonies that A. himself had been a pupil of Gorgias in his youth, T 3 would be even more remarkable. In his later days A. became a Socratic proselyte and shared the sharp criticism of and contempt for sophistic rhetoric which Sokrates had taught his disciples. The essence of Socratic attacks on sophistic rhetoric can be found in Plato's famous dialogues, especially in the *Gorgias*, the *Protagoras* and the first book of the *Politeia*.

A.'s *Archelaos* was named after the Macedonian king Archelaos, who was killed in 399 B.C. in a conspiracy to overthrow his government. According to some ancient testimonies king Archelaos tried without success to invite Sokrates to his court, where in the last years of his reign famous poets, such as the Athenian Euripides, were living. This tradition may have provided A. with a starting point for his *Archelaos*. Perhaps king Archelaos was chosen by A. as a contemporary negative model of the monarchic βίος, since in the Socratic tradition he was regarded as the most unscrupulous of all Macedonians and as a barbarian ruler[78]. A.'s *Archelaos* may have been an answer to the picture of Archelaos which was drawn by the sophist Gorgias in Plato's *Gorgias*. Giannantoni[79] gives a useful overview of different scholarly opinions on the title, the contents, the structure and the disputed authenticity of the *Archelaos*. Because A.'s *Archelaos* is quoted by Athenaios together with his *Politikos*, the two dialogues may also have shared another common theme: a Socratic attack on sophistic rhetoric as a τέχνη.

Johannes ENGELS

Text editions and translations

F. DECLEVA CAIZZI, *Antisthenis Fragmenta* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' antichità 13), Milano - Varese 1966.
E. DIEHL, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, II (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1942².
H. DITTMAR, *Aeschines von Sphettos. Studien zur Litteraturgeschichte der Sokratiker* (Philologische Untersuchungen 21), Berlin 1912.
I. DÜRING, *Herodicus the Cratetean*, Stockholm 1941.
G. GIANNANTONI, *Socraticorum Reliquiae* (Elenchos 7), 4 vol., Roma 1983-1985.

[78] Cf. e.g. PLAT. *Gorg.* 471a-d.
[79] Cf. GIANNANTONI IV n. 39 (1990: 388-391).

G. GIANNANTONI, *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae* (Elenchos 18), 4 vol., Napoli 1990.
M. GIGANTE, *Diogenes Laertius. Vite dei filosofi*, Bari 1987[2].
CH.B. GULICK, *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists* (Loeb Classical Library), 7 vol., London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1957[2].
H. KRAUSS, *Aeschinis Socratici reliquiae* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1911.
H.S. LONG, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* II (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964.
D.L. PAGE, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
I. SCOTT-KILVERT, *The Rise and Fall of Athens. Nine Greek Lives by Plutarch*, London 1960.
A.PH. SEGONDS, *Proclus. Sur le premier Alcibiade de Platon*, I (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1985.
J. SOLANA DUESCO, *Aspasia de Mileto, Testimonios y discursos. Edición bilingüe. Selección, prólogo, estudio introductorio, traducción y notas* (Textos y documentos. Clásicos del Pensamiento y de las Ciencias 18), Barcelona 1994.
TH. THALHEIM, *Lysiae orationes* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1901.
F. WEHRLI, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Heft VII. *Herakleides Pontikos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1969[2].
L.G. WESTERINK, *Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*, Amsterdam 1954.
L.G. WESTERINK, *Olympiodorus. Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*, Amsterdam 1956.
D. YOUNG, *Theognis* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1971[2].

Secondary literature

E.F. BLOEDOW, *Not the Son of Achilles, but Achilles Himself: Alcibiades' Entry on the Political Stage at Athens II*, in *Historia* 39 (1990), p. 1-19.
E.F. BLOEDOW, *Alcibiades: a Review Article*, in *AHB* 5 (1991), p.17-29 (= 1991a).
E.F. BLOEDOW, *On Nurturing Lions in the State: Alcibiades' Entry on the Political Stage at Athens*, in *Klio* 73 (1991), p. 49-65 (= 1991b).
E.F. BLOEDOW, *Alcibiades "Brilliant" or "Intelligent"?*, in *Historia* 41 (1992), p. 139-157.
R. BRACHT BRANHAM – M.-O. GOULET-CAZÉ (ed.), *The Cynics. The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1996.
W.R. CONNOR, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1968.
J.K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C*, Oxford 1971.
J. DE ROMILLY, *Alcibiade ou les dangers de l'ambition*, Paris 1995.
R. DEVELIN, *Athenian Officials 684-321 B.C.*, Cambridge 1989.
D.R. DUDLEY, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.*, London 1937 (= Hildesheim 1967).
W.M. ELLIS, *Alcibiades*, London - New York 1989.
J. ENGELS, *Der Michigan-Papyrus über Theramenes und die Ausbildung des 'Theramenes-Mythos'*, in *ZPE* 99 (1993), p. 125-155.

M.A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1994.
S. Forde, *The Ambition to Rule. Alcibiades and the Politics of Imperialism in Thucydides*, Ithaca 1989.
B. Gentili – G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought*, Amsterdam 1988.
D.L. Gera, *Xenophon's Cyropaedia*, Oxford 1993.
G. Giannantoni, *Antistene fondatore della scuola cinica?*, in M.-O. Goulet-Cazé-R. Goulet (ed.), *Le Cynisme ancient et ses prolongements*, Paris 1993, p. 15-34.
A.W. Gomme – K.J. Dover – A. Andrewes, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I-V, Oxford 1945-1981.
M.-O. Goulet-Cazé – R. Goulet (ed.), *Le Cynisme ancient et ses prolongements*, Paris 1993.
M.M. Henry, *Prisoner of History. Aspasia of Miletos and Her Biographical Tradition*, Oxford 1995.
R. Höistad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King. Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*, Uppsala 1948.
R. Klein, *Die innenpolitische Gegnerschaft gegen Perikles* (1976), in G. Wirth (ed.), *Perikles und seine Zeit*, Darmstadt 1979, p. 494-533.
N. Loraux, *Aspasia: la straniera, l'intelletuale*, in: N. Loraux (ed.), *Grecia al femminile*, Roma 1993, p. 123-154.
J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978.
A. Müller, *De Antisthenis Cynici vita et scriptis*, Marburg 1860.
P. Natorp, art. *Antisthenes* (10), in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 2538-2545.
L. Paquet, *Les Cyniques grecs. Fragments et temoignages*, Ottawa 1988[2].
A. Patzer, *Antisthenes der Sokratiker. Das literarische Werk und die Philosophie dargestellt am Katalog der Schriften*, Diss. Heidelberg 1970.
C. Pelling, *Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography*, in C. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Oxford 1990, p. 213-244.
L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*, I-II, Paris 1993.
L. Prandi, *Il P. Lit. London 123 e la fortuna storiografica di Alcibiade*, in *Aegyptus* 72 (1992), p. 3-21.
G. Prestel, *Die antidemokratische Strömung im Athen des fünften Jahrhunderts bis zum Tode des Perikles*, Breslau 1939 (= Aalen 1974).
K. Raaflaub, *Politisches Denken und Krise der Polis. Athen im Verfassungskonflikt des späten fünften Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, in *HZ* 255 (1992), p. 1-60.
H.D. Rankin, *Sophists, Socratics and Cynics*, London, Canberra - Totowa NJ 1983.
H.D. Rankin, *Antisthenes Sokratikos*, Amsterdam 1986.
P.J. Rhodes, *"What Alcibiades did or what happened to him"*, Durham 1985.
J.T. Roberts, *Athens on Trial. The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought*, Princeton 1994.
D.A. Russell, *Plutarch, Alcibiades 1-16*, in *PCPA* 192 n.s. 12 (1966), p. 37-47 (= B. Scardigli (ed.), *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, Oxford 1995, p. 191-207).
D.A. Russell, *Plutarch*, London 1973.
J. Schwarze, *Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie und ihre historische und historiographische Bedeutung*, München 1971.
G.S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, Montreal 1991.
F. Susemihl, *Der Idealstaat des Antisthenes und die Dialoge Archelaos, Kyros und*

Herakles, in *Jahrbücher für class. Philologie hrsg. von A. Fleckeisen* 33. Jahrgang (1887), p. 207-214.

J. Tatum, *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Kyros*, Princeton 1989.

St. von der Lahr, *Dichter und Tyrannen im archaischen Griechenland. Das Corpus Theognideum als zeitgenössische Quelle politischer Wertvorstellungen archaisch-griechischer Aristokraten*, München 1992.

J. Wieseöhfer, *Das antike Persien von 550 v. Chr. bis 650 n. Chr.*, München - Zürich 1994.

H. Wolff, *Die Opposition gegen die radikale Demokratie in Athen bis zum Jahre 411 v. Chr.*, in *ZPE* 36 (1979), p. 279-302.

G. Zecchini, *La cultura storica di Ateneo*, Milano 1989.

E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, II,1: *Sokrates und die Sokratiker. Plato und die alte Akademie*, Leipzig 1922^5 (= 1963).

1005-1007. Writers on the Seven Sages

Preliminary observations

The latest scholar to address ancient legendry about the Seven Sages in full is D. Fehling[1]. In this scholar's view the constitution of the main features of the ancient legends concerning the Seven Sages—their number, their sayings and the tradition about the Prize for Wisdom—can be traced back to just two key figures. Plato, the earliest surviving author from antiquity to mention the *collegium* (*Prot.* 343a), would effectively have been the first to launch the concept of a group of seven wise men and to link their sagacity to the famous maxims of Delphic wisdom. Kallimachos supposedly was the first to modify Plato's list of seven names, thus establishing what in later times became the most common composition of the group (an issue which was subject to much variation in the fourth and third centuries B.C.), and he is also held to have been the source of the legend of the Ἀγὼν σοφίας (F 191,32-77 PFEIFFER I). These conclusions are the result of a professedly painstaking and unprejudiced, yet ultimately excessively conjectural and sceptical and, consequently, erroneous and misleading analysis of all available evidence in regard to the *collegium* and the *Agon*. This is not the place to review the German scholar's monograph in full, which is also concerned with the relationship between the Sages and early Greek chronology. Still, the main shortcomings of his investigation into ancient traditions about the Seven Sages, which takes up the first two chapters of his study and which results in the questioning of almost all references to fourth-century writers on the subject, should nevertheless be laid bare here[2].

Fehling's position is problematic right from the outset. By adamantly claiming that the *collegium* of the Seven Sages mentioned by Plato was purely an invention of the latter which sprang from a jocular adaptation of data derived from Herodotos, Simonides and Hipponax[3], he flatly denies the existence of anonymous oral tradi-

---

[1] See FEHLING (1985: 9-65).

[2] This is also important because only one proper review has seen the light of day, which is surprisingly benevolent to Fehling in regard to the passages that concern us here: see BICHLER (1989: 187-192).

[3] In FEHLING's wording (1985: 13), "eine scherzhafte Konstruktion"; for the full argument, see FEHLING (1985: 13-18). One of the elements which give the joke away, Fehling holds, is the inclusion among the Seven Sages of the obscure Myson and the even rarer ethnic Χηνεύς added to his name: Plato allegedly invented it specially for Myson ("es gab den Ort nämlich nicht"), as would seem to be borne out by the fact

tions and folk tales on the subject, despite the unmistakably folkloristic nature of many features of the ancient stories regarding the Seven: thus, with a single stroke he brushes aside the findings of anthropological research in the past few decades, which has shown oral tradition to be a quintessential element of the early phases of any human culture[4].

In regard to the literary side of ancient tradition on the Seven Sages prior to Plato and in the time of the latter, the German scholar also adopts a highly contestable viewpoint. On the one hand he posits that we know the names of every writer active in the pre-Alexandrian period, both those whose works have been preserved in full and those whom we only know through citations. Accordingly, in Fehling's view, it is futile to construct hypotheses about authors prior to Plato who are also said to have written on the topic, but whose works supposedly have failed to leave even the slightest trace in our sources and whom we can no longer even identify by name; in the same train of thought the only advantage writers from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. have over us is that they had every piece of writing available to them in full, whereas we have to content ourselves with the fragments of some of them.

On the other hand Fehling is convinced that every source reference given by post-Alexandrian authors to writers active in the fifth and fourth centuries is, by definition, a forgery: either a given quotation is invented, or its alleged author as well. His suspicion results from the fact that the three main sources of ancient tradition on the Seven Sages—Diodoros, Plutarch and Diogenes Laertios—all relate variants on the same themes and nevertheless cite no sources or else completely different ones: when considered in combination with the long-standing notoriety, in certain quarters of modern scholarship, of these three authors as highly unreliable and unthinking personalities, this can, in Fehling's opinion, only be taken to mean that their stories and the accompanying source references are all, without exception, pure inventions with no historical basis, contrived by the respective

---

that the village is only ever mentioned in connection with Myson and by the uncertainty already of the ancients regarding its exact name and location. True though the first part of this 'explanation' may be (even so, it hardly amounts to a serious argument), at least Pausanias' exact reference (at 10,24.1) to a village located in Oite (that is, the central part of the mountain range due south of the valley of the river Spercheios) corresponding to the ethnic Χηνεύς, would seem to provide sufficient ground for questioning Fehling's doubts in this respect, which are not shared by any other modern scholar: see FEHLING (1985: 15 n. 11) for all references.

[4] This criticism is not new; it has already been levelled against Fehling in a review of his monograph on Herodotos' source citations (published 1971; 1989[2]): see BOWDEN (1992: 183).

writers in order to conceal their dependence on their direct sources and to convey an impression of originality[5].

Each of the issues touched upon in the previous three paragraphs warrants full treatment, but a few considerations must suffice here. To begin with it is, from a methodological point of view, unquestionably commendable to recognize the great dangers and the large degree of uncertainty involved in invoking anonymous oral storytelling and no longer extant authors in order to reconstruct the obscure origin and development of certain traditions (after all, there is nothing disgraceful about admitting that our knowledge is defective). However, going to the other extreme and dismissing outright the idea that both categories can actually be taken into account as uncertain factors in the process is simply a sterile approach: the sheer number of authors and writings from antiquity which are only known to us through a mere handful of quotations at the most[6], is enough to dispel any misguided conceptions we might entertain about the limited scope of our knowledge of what the ancients have actually produced in the literary field.

Secondly, Fehling all too eagerly tosses aside the vast majority of references to fourth- and third-century sources, on the basis of hypotheses and assumptions that are no less dubious and gratuitous than the conjectures he claims to be combating in the first place. Already his basic assumption—that Diodoros, Plutarch and Diogenes Laertios alike should have provided the same list of early sources for the various accounts if those sources had really existed—is ill-conceived. It is inappropriate to apply the basic rules of modern historical research (in this case, the conscientious and systematic citing of one's sources) to ancient practice, let alone to draw conclusions regarding the reliability of an ancient author's information from the apparent disregard thereof[7]. Besides, if one looks at the varied nature of the works of the three writers and the context in which they bring up the subject, it is clear that one cannot expect all of them to have dealt with the matter in an equally thorough manner. Undoubtedly

---

[5] As FEHLING (1985: 39) sees it, Diodoros was the first to invent variants of Kallimachos' version; Plutarch drew on Diodoros, added some stories of his own and invented a reference to Theophrastos; Diogenes went totally out of his way by thinking up a whole batch of authors as well as new stories in order to conceal his dependence on both Diodoros and Plutarch.

[6] A quick glance through the sixteen volumes of *FGrHist* that have been published so far is already highly instructive in this respect.

[7] Similar criticism of Fehling can be found, for instance, in the reviews of the monograph on Herodotos by BOWDEN (1992: 183) and FOWLER (1996: 82-83).

Diodoros had not much room for an ample discussion of current legends about the Seven, replete with full source acknowledgements, in his universal history[8]; similarly Plutarch devoted only one chapter of his biography of Solon to the Ἀγών and the *migratio tripodis*, hence it was not imperative for him to produce a full set of sources[9]; Diogenes Laertios, on the other hand, devoted the entire first book of his work to the lives of Greek wise men, and he explicitly announces on two occasions that he will give general notices of the Seven Sages and of the stories about the Prize for Wisdom[10]. Therefore it is perfectly understandable that Diodoros did not mention his sources by name, that Plutarch named only one and that Diogenes Laertios mentioned a veritable plethora of earlier writers.

Thirdly, it is gratuitous to affirm that Diodoros (the earliest of the three to quote authorities) regarded Kallimachos' account of the Ἀγών as the authoritative one and therefore went to great lengths to contrive several variants himself, while in the extant text—the admit-

---

8 Admittedly, we must be aware of the fact that Diodoros' book 9 has not been preserved in full, but is known only through the Byzantine *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*. Having said that, the suggestion that Diodoros sat down to invent stories on his own in order to flesh out his universal history and to cloak his lack of originality, is hardly convincing.

9 He only mentions one, Theophrastos (PLUT. *Sol.* 4,7 = T 583 FORTENBAUGH ET AL.). *Pace* FEHLING (1985: 38), this quotation easily stands up to close scrutiny, given the interest generated by the traditions concerning the Seven Sages among the Peripatetics in general. This interest, which we have no reason to doubt Theophrastos shared with his colleagues, is borne out by several F attributable to Aristotle or members of his school: cf. ARISTOTLE Περὶ φιλοσοφίας F 3 ROSE = F 3 ROSS = F 3 UNTERSTEINER = F 28-29 GIGON; DIKAIARCHOS F 30-32 WEHRLI I, possibly from a monograph on the Seven Sages; DEMETRIOS OF PHALERON F 114 WEHRLI IV, from Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα; KLEARCHOS F 69-71 WEHRLI III, from Περὶ παροιμίων; STRATON OF LAMPSAKOS F 146-147 WEHRLI V, from Εὑρημάτων ἔλεγχοι. We know furthermore that THEOPHRASTOS wrote a work Περὶ τῶν σοφῶν, only the title of which survives (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 5,48 = T 727,12 FORTENBAUGH ET AL.). WEHRLI IV (1968^2: 69) was somewhat reluctant to make suggestions about the contents of this work and about the (scope of the) treatment of the Seven Sages in it, but in view of the other F mentioned above, and since, moreover, we know that Aristotle's successor discussed the Γνῶθι σαυτόν in his treatise Περὶ παροιμιῶν (cf. STOB. *Ecl.* 3,21.12 p. 558-559 HENSE I), it would seem that such hesitation is not called for; MONTANARI in GALLO – MONTANARI – MESSERI SAVORELLI – CARLINI (1992: 260), for one, assumed that the work did in fact deal with the Seven Sages.
For recent discussion of the Peripatetics' attention to the Seven Sages, see, in addition to Wehrli's comments on the passages just quoted, MONTANARI in GALLO – MONTANARI – MESSERI SAVORELLI – CARLINI (1992: 260-262).

10 Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,40 (Περὶ δὴ τῶν ἑπτά—ἄξιον γὰρ ἐνταῦθα καθολικῶς κἀκείνων ἐπιμνησθῆναι—λόγοι φέρονται τοιοῦτοι; *This seems the proper place for a general notice of the Seven Sages, of whom we have such accounts as the following*) and 1,27-33 (*passim*) respectively; the translation given is that of HICKS.

tedly fragmentary remains of book 9—there is not so much as the slightest trace of the great poet: to make use of Diodoros-excerptors to solve this awkward incommodity[11] is just too opportunistic. Actually the surviving evidence from antiquity seems to confirm Plutarch's indication that Kallimachos' version did not belong to the commonly accepted canon[12]: it is known to us only through the fortuitous find of P.Oxy. 1011 and a quotation by none other than Diogenes Laertios (1,28-29), who has been stigmatized by Fehling as one of the worst forgers around in Antiquity.

These general objections aside, there are several specific considerations which can be adduced to the detriment of the argument of the German scholar. Indeed, if we take a renewed look at the individual cases of early sources—from the 5th to 3th centuries B.C., prior to or contemporary with either Plato or Kallimachos—which Fehling has raised doubts about, it appears that the ancient evidence is anything but the nest of falsifications he makes it out to be. Instead, the German scholar can be shown to have built his theory on shaky or downright dubious grounds, to have jumped to conclusions and to have relegated relevant information to an inconspicuous footnote.

Firstly, Athenaios has reported a version of the *Agon* on the authority of the early Hellenistic poet Phoinix of Kolophon which is closely similar to that of Kallimachos[13]. Fehling, however, has been hasty in dismissing this testimony. As it appears to him improbable that both poets, "who were almost contemporaries", dealt with the same story in the same metre, he assumes forthwith that Phoinix could only have touched upon it summarily, *after* Kallimachos' fuller version—thereby conveniently forgetting that modern scholarship tends to regard Phoinix as the older of the two poets...[14].

Secondly, the available information suggests that Demetrios of Phaleron, like many other prominent members of the Peripatos in the second half of the fourth century B.C.[15], took a keen interest in the

---

[11] FEHLING (1985: 36 n. 59): "Diodor mag Kallimachos' Version genannt haben (...) das konnten die Exzerptoren weglassen."

[12] Cf. PLUT. *Sol.* 4,8, where there is a reference to the story as given by Kallimachos, albeit without mention of the latter's name, after a survey of the manifold guises of the version which "ὑπὸ πλειόνων τεθρύληται."

[13] Cf. ATHEN. 11,495d (= F 4 p. 234 POWELL).

[14] See CLAYMAN (1980: 68-69); FRASER I (1972: 554) and II (1972: 1030-1031 n. 136). However, see Pfeiffer's commentary on line 1 of Kallimachos' F 191—PFEIFFER I (1965^2: 161)—for a second opinion, similar to that of Fehling, on Phoinix' debt to the great Alexandrian poet.

[15] Cf. *supra*, p. 115 n. 9.

legends concerning the Seven Sages and wrote a lot about them. As a matter of fact, he is credited with the calculation of the archon year corresponding to the Epoch of the Seven Sages and with a collection of *Apophthegms* of the various members of the revered *collegium* (Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα)[16]. In Fehling's study, however, very little remains of this. To begin with, the German scholar asserts that the calculation of the epochal year was actually the work of Aristotle. This, however, is a fallacious assumption based on a number of unfounded and cheap claims[17]. In addition, no mention whatever is made of the fact that the names of the Seven Sages as contained in Demetrios' collection of sayings correspond exactly with those featured in Kallimachos' first *Iambus*. Surely this gravely upsets the pivotal position within the tradition of the legends about the Seven Sages which Fehling has so generously created for Kallimachos.

His claim is weakened further when we turn to Diogenes Laertios. Fehling has drawn up a list of no less than seven early sources, cited on the Sages' *Agon* in the Laertian's first book, who he claims are not attested anywhere else in the ancient evidence and whose names (all but one) he alleges to be modifications of genuine names, thought up by Diogenes in a clumsy attempt to conceal the fact that he has invented them[18]. In addition Fehling has indicated a few cases in which not the cited source altogether, but 'merely' a reference to a passage of a well-known author is disposed of as a fictitious creation of the Laertian. Thus, he rids himself for instance of the quotation from Eudoxos of Knidos concerning the Sages' Ἀγών (Diog. Laert. 1,29-30 = *FGrHist* 1006 F 1) on the long-standing assumption that Diogenes simply invented most of his so-called 'information', as would be illustrated in this particular instance by the omission of a precise book-title or -number in the reference[19].

---

[16] Cf. *FGrHist* 228 F 1 and F 114, 149 Wehrli IV with the respective commentaries.

[17] See Fehling (1985: 98-99; 115-117). He gratuitously states that the Stagirite must have been concerned with the Seven Sages in his *Register of Victors in the Pythian Games*. Likewise, there is no ground for his statement that according to Plato the Seven were officially declared Sages by Delphic priesthood while all were physically present, and further, that this could only have happened after Solon had returned from his many years' journey undertaken in order to secure the implementation of his legislation. Lastly, he rids himself of a divergence between the archon lists of Aristotle and Demetrios by postulating that the latter made the small change "aus irgendeinem Grund (*sic!*)"—a small intervention which conveniently renders futile "a great amount of fruitless discussions and attempts at harmonization ..."

[18] See Fehling (1985: 29-31; 32-33; 46).

[19] See Fehling (1985: 33).

This seemingly convincing exposure of the Laertian as an unreliable fraud, now, on closer investigation turns out to be a hoax itself. In the introduction to the commentary on the F of Andron of Ephesos (no. 1005 in the present volume) the list of allegedly invented sources will be examined in detail[20]. Anticipating the conclusions reached there, it may suffice here to say that the historical existence of at least two of the seven authors who supposedly only existed in Diogenes' mind, can be vindicated on the strength both of their names and of references to them in sources independent from the Laertian. Accordingly, it would appear that all of the otherwise allegedly unidentifiable authors singled out by the German scholar as figments of Diogenes Laertios deserve a rehabilitation, or at least that a fresh investigation into their existence is called for. This conclusion is supported by, and in turn goes a long way toward substantiating the now current scholarly view that Diogenes Laertios did not just invent every other source he cites, but really appears to have adopted the standard ancient practice of heuristics[21]. Along the same lines Diogenes' reference to Eudoxos' version of the Sages' *Agon* can plausibly be accepted, the more so because this polymath intrinsically qualifies as a writer who could well have dealt with the Seven Sages in one of his known works (most likely the Γῆς περίοδος), without necessarily devoting an entire monograph to the subject[22]. The fact that the Laertian in the case of Eudoxos does not refer to a specific title and book-number is simply immaterial, since in antiquity source citations were not required to contain such detailed information in the first place.

To close the book on Fehling's discussion it may, last but not least, be pointed out that the final result of his simple, or even simplistic, reconstruction is intrinsically implausible: a mere handful of fourth and third-century writers survive, who actually wrote, in the wake of Plato, on the Seven Sages, and each and every one was a famous and influential man of letters: Ephoros, Aristotle, Demetrios of Phaleron, Anaximenes of Lampsakos, Dikaiarchos of Messene and Kallimachos. At the end of the day it is hard to conceive that such great authors could have been alone in appreciating Plato's joke, then de-

---

[20] Cf. *infra*, p. 128-131.

[21] See Mejer (1978: 16-29). On Diogenes' working habits (the excerpting process and the citation of his sources), and on the method of literary composition of ancient scholarly works in general, see also Hahm (1992: 4077-4082), with references to older literature.

[22] See the introduction to the commentary on the F of Eudoxos (*FGrHist* 1006), *infra*, p. 170-171.

velop it within a historical framework and ultimately elevate it to the status of a constitutive ingredient of Panhellenic culture.

In conclusion we find that Fehling's analysis of ancient tradition on the Seven Sages does rank injustice to the available evidence, which can be proven to be trustworthy after all, and which actually hints at a reality much more complex than that envisaged by the German scholar. There are, therefore, hardly any grounds for abandoning the commonly-accepted view on the subject, according to which the tales about the *collegium* of Seven Wise Men began circulating as folk stories in the late sixth and fifth centuries and were committed to writing shortly thereafter[23].

Jan Bollansée

[23] See, for instance, Zeller I.1 (1919^6: 158-163); Barkowski (1923: 2248); Fränkel (1962^2: 274-276); Snell (1966: 115-118); Lesky (1971^3: 187-188); Wehrli (1973: 193-208); Gärtner (1975: 177-178); Kindstrand (1981: 33); most recently, see Griffiths (1996: 1397).

Text editions

I. Gallo – F. Montanari – G. Messeri Savorelli – A. Carlini, *Hermippus*, in AA.VV., *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini. Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina,* Parte I*: Autori noti,* vol. 1**, Firenze 1992, p. 249-267.

R. Pfeiffer, Callimachus, I. *Fragmenta.* II. *Hymni et epigrammata*, Oxford 1965[2].

M. Untersteiner, Aristotele, *Della filosofia. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento esegetico* (Temi e testi 10), Roma 1963.

F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Text und Kommentar*, IV. *Demetrios von Phaleron*, Basel - Stuttgart 1968[2].

Secondary literature

O. Barkowski, art. *Sieben Weise*, in *RE* 2A, 2 (1923), col. 2242-2264.

R. Bichler, rec. *D. Fehling, Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie*, in *AA* 42 (1989), col. 187-192.

H. Bowden, rec. *D. Fehling, Herodotus and his 'Sources': citation, invention and narrative art; J. Gould, Herodotus; D. Lateiner, The historical method of Herodotus*, in *JHS* 112 (1992), p. 182-184.

D.L. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi*, Leiden 1980.

D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'. Citation, Invention and Narrative Art. Translated by J.G. Howie*, Leeds 1989[2].

D. Fehling, *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot. Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots*, Berlin - New York 1971.

D. Fehling, *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Studie*, Bern - Frankfurt am Main - New York 1985.

R.L. Fowler, *Herodotos and his Contemporaries*, in *JHS* 116 (1996), p. 62-87.

P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vol., Oxford 1972.

H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts*, München 1962[2].

H. Gärtner, art. *Die Sieben Weisen*, in *DKP* 5 (1975), col. 177-178.

A.H. Griffiths, art. *Seven Sages*, in *OCD* (1996[3]), p. 1397.

D.E. Hahm, *Diogenes Laertius VII: On the Stoics*, in W. Haase (ed.), *ANRW* II 36,6, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 4076-4182.

J.F. Kindstrand, *Anacharsis. The Legend and the Apophthegmata*, Uppsala 1981.

J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978.

G. Shrimpton – K.M. Gillis, *Appendix 1. Herodotus' Source Citations*, in G.S. Shrimpton, *History and Memory in Ancient Greece*, Montreal - Kingston - London - Buffalo 1997, p. 229-265.

B. Snell, *Zur Geschichte vom Gastmahl der Sieben Weisen*, in O. Hiltbrunner – H. Kornhardt – F. Tietze (ed.), *Thesaurismata. Festschrift für Ida Kapp zum 70. Geburtstag*, München 1954, p. 105-111 (= B. Snell, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Göttingen 1966, p. 115-118) (cited after the 1966 edition).

E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, I.1. *Allgemeine Einleitung. Vorsokratische Philosophie (erste Hälfte)*, Leipzig 1919^6 (= Darmstadt 1963).

1005. Andron of Ephesos

(first half 4th cent. B.C.)

T

1 a) Diog. Laert. 1,119: Ἄνδρων δ' ὁ Ἐφέσιός φησι κτλ. (cf. F 4). **b)** Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 2,17 p. 216 Drachmann III: (...) Ἄνδρων ὁ Ἐφέσιος (cf. F 2b).

2 a) Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1,129.4: (...) ὥς φησιν Ἄνδρων ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι (cf. F 1). **b)** Diog. Laert. 1,30: Ἄνδρων δ' ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι κτλ. (cf. F 2a). **c)** Porphyr. *Φιλόλογος ἀκρόασις ap.* Eus. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.6: Ἄνδρωνος γὰρ ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι κτλ. (cf. F 3a). **d)** Phot. *Lex.*—*Suda* Σ 77 *s.v.* Σαμίων ὁ δῆμός ἐστιν ὡς πολυγράμματος· (...) ὡς Ἄνδρων ἐν Τρίποδι (cf. F 5).

F

ΤΡΙΠΟΥΣ

(F 1-6)

1 (*FHG* II, p. 347, F 3) Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1,129.4: Συνεχρόνισαν δὲ οἱ συγκαταλεγέντες σοφοὶ τῷ Θαλεῖ, ὥς φησιν Ἄνδρων ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι.

2 (*FHG* F 1) **a)** Diog. Laert. 1,30-31: Ἄνδρων δ' ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι Ἀργείους ἆθλον ἀρετῆς τῷ σοφωτάτῳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τρίποδα θεῖναι· κριθῆναι δὲ Ἀριστόδημον Σπαρτιάτην, ὃν παραχωρῆσαι Χίλωνι. **b)** (*FHG* F 2) Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 2,17 p. 216 Drachmann III:

> Σπαρτιάτην δὲ Ἀριστόδημον ἐν τοῖς ἑπτὰ σοφοῖς ἀναγράφει Ἄνδρων ὁ Ἐφέσιος.

3 (*FHG* F 6) Porphyr. *Φιλόλογος ἀκρόασις* (408F Smith) *ap.* Eus. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.4;5-9: (4) (...) ὁ γραμματικὸς Ἀπολλώνιος ἔφη· "(...) (5) Πραγμάτων δ'

7-8 ἐστι *om. Phot.* : ἐστιν ὡς πολυγράμματος *om. Suda* : *cf. Plut. Per. 26,4* **15** ἀναγράφει *a* : ἀναγράφεται *BD*

1005. Andron of Ephesos
(1st half 4th cent. B.C.)

T

1 Andron of Ephesos ...

2 Andron in the *Tripod* ...

F

TRIPOD

1 According to Andron in the *Tripod*, those who share the title of sage with Thales were contemporaries of his.

2 a) Andron reports in the *Tripod* that the Argives offered a tripod as a prize for virtue to the wisest of the Greeks; Aristodemos of Sparta was adjudged the winner, but he ceded the prize to Chilon.

b) Andron of Ephesos records Aristodemos of Sparta among the Seven Sages.

3 Apollonios the grammarian remarked: "(...) He (*sc.* Theopompos) has also

ὑφαίρεσιν πεποίηται (*sc.* ὁ Θεόπομπος; *FGrHist* 115 F 70), μεταθεὶς τὰ ἐπ' ἄλλων ἄλλοις, ἵνα καὶ ψεύστης ἁλῷ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον. (6) Ἄνδρωνος γὰρ ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι περὶ Πυθαγόρου τοῦ φιλοσόφου τὰ περὶ τὰς προρρήσεις ἱστορηκότος, εἰπόντος τε ὡς διψήσας ποτὲ ἐν Μεταποντίῳ καὶ ἔκ τινος φρέατος ἀνιμήσας καὶ πιὼν προεῖπεν, ὡς εἰς τρίτην ἡμέραν ἔσοιτο σεισμός." Καὶ ἕτερά τινα τούτοις ἐπαγαγὼν ἐπιλέγει· (7) "Ταῦτ' οὖν τοῦ Ἄνδρωνος περὶ Πυθαγόρου ἱστορηκότος πάντα ὑφείλετο Θεόπομπος· εἰ μὲν περὶ Πυθαγόρου λέγων, τάχα ἂν καὶ ἕτεροι ἠπίσταντο περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγον· 'ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν'· νῦν δὲ τὴν κλοπὴν δήλην πεποίηκεν ἡ τοῦ ὀνόματος μετάθεσις· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ πράγμασι κέχρηται τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ἕτερον δ' ὄνομα μετενήνοχε· Φερεκύδην γὰρ τὸν Σύριον πεποίηκε ταῦτα προλέγοντα. (8) Οὐ μόνον δὲ τούτῳ τῷ ὀνόματι ἀποκρύπτει τὴν κλοπήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τόπων μεταθέσει. Τό τε γὰρ περὶ τῆς προρρήσεως τοῦ σεισμοῦ ἐν Μεταποντίῳ ὑπ' Ἄνδρωνος ῥηθὲν ἐν Σύρῳ εἰρῆσθαί φησιν ὁ Θεόπομπος, τό τε περὶ τὸ πλοῖον οὐκ ἀπὸ Μεγάρων τῆς Σικελίας, ἀπὸ δὲ Σάμου φησὶ θεωρηθῆναι· καὶ τὴν Συβάρεως ἅλωσιν ἐπὶ τὴν Μεσσήνης μετέθηκεν. (9) Ἵνα δέ τι δοκῇ λέγειν περιττόν, καὶ τοῦ ξένου προστέθεικε τοὔνομα, Περίλαον αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι λέγων."

4 (*FHG* F 5) Diog. Laert. 1,119: Ἄνδρων δ' ὁ Ἐφέσιός φησι δύο γεγονέναι Φερεκύδας Συρίους, τὸν μὲν ἀστρολόγον, τὸν δὲ θεολόγον υἱὸν Βάβυος, ᾧ καὶ Πυθαγόραν σχολάσαι. Ἐρατοσθένης (*FGrHist* 241 F 10) δ' ἕνα μόνον, καὶ ἕτερον Ἀθηναῖον, γενεαλόγον.

5 (*FHG* F 7) Phot. *Lex.*—*Suda* Σ 77 *s.v.* Σαμίων ὁ δῆμός ἐστιν ὡς πολυγράμματος· Ἀριστοφάνης Βαβυλωνίοις (F 71 Kassel – Austin III,2), ἐπισκώπτων τοὺς ἐστιγμένους. Οἱ γὰρ Σάμιοι καταπονηθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων σπάνει τῶν πολιτευομένων ἐπέγραψαν τοῖς δούλοις ἐκ πέντε στατήρων τὴν ἰσοπολιτείαν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Σαμίων πολιτείᾳ (F 575 Rose = F 592 Gigon). Ἢ ὅτι παρὰ Σαμίοις εὑρέθη πρώτοις τὰ κ̅δ̅ γράμματα ὑπὸ Καλλιστράτου, ὡς Ἄνδρων ἐν Τρίποδι. Τοὺς δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἔπεισε χρῆσθαι τοῖς τῶν Ἰώνων γράμμασιν Ἀρχῖνος [δ' Ἀθηναίοις] ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Εὐκλείδου. Τοὺς δὲ Βαβυλωνίους ἐδίδαξε διὰ

---

27 εἶπεν *Viger in marg.* : εἰπών *codd.* : Ταῦτα ἐκείνῳ αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν *Corssen (1911: 1389-1390)* : ταὐτὰ <ἃ> καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν *Diels ap. Jacoby* **31** συρίω *codd.* : Συρῳ *corr. edd.* **38** Βάβυος *w* : βαβους *B* : βάδυος *FP*^{pc} **40-41** ἐστι *om. Phot.* : ἐστιν ὡς πολυγράμματος *om. Suda* : *cf. Plut. Per. 26,4* **46-47** Ἀρχῖνος [δ' Ἀθηναίοις] *Bernhardy* : ἄρχειν οἱ δ' Ἀθηναίοις *Phot.* : Ἀρχίνου δ' Ἀθηναίου *Suda* : Ἀρχῖνος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος *Porson Dobree Taylor* : Ἀρχίνους ὁ Ἀθηναίου *Sudae ed. Bas. 1543* : Ἀρχίνους Ἀθηναῖος *Kuster*

pilfered stories, assigning anecdotes to the wrong people; wherefore he can be exposed as a plagiarist in this way also. Andron in his *Tripod* recounts the stories about the predictions of Pythagoras the philosopher: how once in Metapontion he was thirsty and drew water from some well; after drinking he predicted there would be an earthquake on the third day." He (*sc*. Apollonios-Porphyry) also relates other stories in connection with these: "Now Theopompos has filched all of Andron's stories about Pythagoras; but if he (*sc*. Theopompos) had spoken about Pythagoras, perhaps others, too, would have known about him (*sc*. Pythagoras) and said: 'He himself said that.' But now the change of name has made the theft clear. For using the same matters, he has substituted another name; for he has made Pherekydes of Syros the one predicting these things. But he hides the theft not only by this name, but also by a change of localities. For the prophecy of the earthquake reported by Andron as spoken in Metapontion, Theopompos says was told in Syros, and he says that the incident concerning the ship was seen not from Megara in Sicily, but from Samos, and he has transported the capture of Sybaris to Messene. And in order that he might appear to be saying something extraordinary, he has even added the name of the host, saying that he was called Perilaos."

4 Andron of Ephesos maintains that there were two natives of Syros who bore the name Pherekydes: the one was an astronomer, the other—son of Babys—a theologian and teacher of Pythagoras. Eratosthenes, however, states that there was only one Pherekydes of Syros, the other Pherekydes being an Athenian and a genealogist.

5 How deeply lettered the people of Samos are!: thus Aristophanes in *The Babylonians*, scoffing at the branded people. According to Aristotle in the *Constitution of the Samians*, (*sc*. the poet refers to) the Samians who enfranchised their slaves for five staters, at a time when they were being oppressed by tyranny. Or else (*sc*. the poet coined this phrase) because the twenty-four letters were first invented among the Samians by Kallistratos, as Andron has it in his *Tripod*. Archinos convinced the Athenians to adopt the Ionic alphabet in the archonship of Eukleides. Aristophanes produced his play *The Babylonians* with the help of

Καλλιστράτου Ἀριστοφάνης ἔτεσι πρὸ τοῦ Ἐυκλείδου κ̅ε̅, ἐπὶ Εὐκλέους. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ πείσαντος ἱστορεῖ Θεόπομπος (*FGrHist* 115 F 155). Κτλ.

6 (*FHG sub* 7) Schol. Dion. Thrac. p. 184,20 Hilgard: Φοινίκεια δὲ τὰ γράμματα ἐλέγοντο, ὥς φησιν (...) Ἄνδρων δὲ καὶ Μενεκράτης ὁ Ὀλύνθιος ἀπὸ Φοινίκης τῆς Ἀκταίωνος θυγατρός.

UNCERTAIN

7 (*FHG* F 4) Aristeid. *Or.* 3,677 p. 518 Lenz – Behr I,3: Οὐχ Ἡρόδοτος Σόλωνα (1,29.1) σοφιστὴν κέκληκεν, οὐ Πυθαγόραν (4,95.2) πάλιν, οὐκ Ἀνδροτίων (*FGrHist* 324 F 69) τοὺς Ἑπτὰ σοφιστὰς προσείρηκεν, λέγων δὴ τοὺς σοφούς, καὶ πάλιν αὖ Σωκράτη σοφιστὴν τοῦτον τὸν πάνυ;

---

48 κ̅ε̅ *Bouhier* : καὶ *Phot. et Suda* : κ̅α̅ *Sudae ed. Bas. 1543* : κ̅δ̅ *Clinton* **54** Ἀνδροτίων *O* : Ἄνδρων *Siebelis* **55** λέγων *Reiskius* : λέγω *O (prob. Jacoby, Diels – Kranz)* **56** Σωκράτη *Canter* : σωκράτης *O* : ἰσοκράτην *UR²* : Σωκράτην *Jacoby*

Kallistratos twenty-five years before Eukleides, under Eukles. Theopompos has reported on this person who persuaded the Athenians. (...)

6 The letters were called Phoenician (...) according to Andron and Menekrates of Olynthos after Phoinike, the daughter of Aktaion (...)

UNCERTAIN

7 Did Herodotos not call Solon a sophist, and Pythagoras too? And did Androtion not speak of the Seven Sophists, meaning the Sages, and also about that sophist Sokrates?

1005. Andron of Ephesos

(1st half 4th cent. B.C.)

Introduction

The double pairing of F 2a+b (both dealing with Aristodemos of Sparta as a member of the Seven Sages) and F 3+4 (where Pythagoras is mentioned twice) places the identification of A. ἐν τῷ Τρίποδι (F 1, 2a, 3 and 5) with A. ὁ Ἐφέσιος (F 2b and 4) beyond all doubt[1]. In addition there are solid grounds for combining F 5 with F 6, where an A. is cited without further specification (ethnic or work-title), so the latter passage can also be safely attributed to A. of Ephesos, the author of a work entitled Τρίπους. The upshot is that we have at our disposal at least six quotations, from several different sources, which form a nice little *corpus* of texts and seemingly bear unmistakable testimony to the existence of one of those many ancient writers who have otherwise failed to leave any trace in later tradition.

Nevertheless Fehling has seriously questioned the historical existence of this author, asserting that not just the version of the Ἀγὼν σοφίας recorded on his authority by Diogenes Laertios (F 2), but also the very person himself is merely a fictitious creation of the Laertian. In fact Fehling has inserted A. on a list of no less than seven early sources, cited by the Laertian in his first book, which we do not encounter anywhere else in the ancient evidence and whose names (all but one) look suspiciously like derivations from real names and hence indicate badly cloaked source-inventions by Diogenes—or so it is alleged by the German scholar. A. is thus held to be a clear modification of the name Androtion, just as Euanthes of Miletos (DIOG. LAERT. 1,29) is held to be contrived after Euanthes of Samos (known through PLUT. *Sol.* 11,2), Daidachos the Platonist (DIOG. LAERT. 1,30) after Daimachos of Plataiai (PLUT. *Sync. Sol.-Publ.* 4; *FGrHist* 65), Alexon of Myndos (DIOG. LAERT. 1,29) after Alexandros of Myndos (*FGrHist* 25), Leandrios of Miletos (DIOG. LAERT. 1,28) after Maiandrios of Miletos (*FGrHist* 491-492), and Phanodikos (DIOG. LAERT. 1,31-32) after Phanodemos the Atthidographer (*FGrHist* 325). The seventh name on the list, which is without a parallel, is Eleusis (DIOG. LAERT. 1,29)[2].

However, it has already been explained that the overall view held by Fehling of the early phases of the tradition on the Seven Sages is

[1] Thus already MÜLLER in his introduction (*FHG* II, p. 346).

[2] See FEHLING (1985: 29-31; 32-33; 46).

highly problematic[3]. General considerations aside, several grounds can be adduced to the detriment of this particular argument of the German scholar. A first indication is that of the six names that were supposedly contrived after existing ones, no less than five are actually bona fide names in their own right—Alexon, Euanthes, Leandr(i)os, Phanodikos and A.—which, just like the seventh one (Eleusis), simply cannot be disposed of lightly as derivatives. One would also have to inquire what Diogenes' point was in inventing an obscure Euanthes of Miletos after an equally unknown Euanthes of Samos[4]. More seriously, Fehling has deceptively simplified the complex problems of accuracy and transmission which surround several of the seven authors involved. As it happens, the most striking and flagrant cases in this respect are those of Leandr(i)os of Miletos and of the A. under discussion.

According to Fehling[5] A. ὁ Ἐφέσιος or A. ἐν Τρίποδι ("beides ohne Unterschied gesagt") are only cited in our sources on the Seven Sages or (Pherekydes and) Pythagoras, just as Androtion is mentioned by the second century (A.D.) rhetor P. Aelios Aristeides in connection with the *collegium* and Pythagoras: this doublet cannot be a coincidence and could only have sprung from the Laertian's duplicity. In three small steps Fehling's own beguilement can easily be exposed. Firstly, Androtion has absolutely nothing to do with the reference to Pythagoras in the speech of Aristeides (see the text of F 7), and to claim that the vicinity of the two names alone could have fired Diogenes' imagination (*sic* Fehling) is an indefensible option. Secondly, A. is not just cited in our sources for the two topics mentioned above: F 5-6 touch upon an entirely different subject, namely, the origin of the Ionic alphabet and the designation of the Greek letters as 'Phoenician'. Fehling knows this, but slurs over it, hiding the facts at the back of a footnote[6]. Thirdly, it is simply not true that A. is known to us only through Diogenes Laertios or later tradition depending on the Laertian: this holds only for F 1, 2a-b and 4. Again F 5-6 serve to falsify Fehling's thesis: there is *no* (direct or oblique) relation to the work of Diogenes in them, since the latter nowhere in his work addresses the issues concerned. Moreover, it requires a considerable stretch of the imagination to appreciate the contention that Eusebios (whose use of Diogenes is not even an established fact) would have invented the text of F 3 on the basis of a *mélange* of Diog. Laert.

---

3 Cf. *supra*, p. 112-119, for the *Preliminary observations*.
4 See the forthcoming commentary on *FGrHist* 1018-1019 in fascicle IV A 2.
5 See Fehling (1985: 33).
6 Fehling (1985: 33 n. 55): "Nur bei Suidas neuer Inhalt."

1,116 (the obvious parallel to the F in question) and Diog. Laert. 1,119 (where the Laertian does, indeed, cite A.)[7]: Fehling overlooks not only the fact that Eusebios is citing Porphyry, but also that Porphyry, in turn, had referred to early Hellenistic sources[8] who, for obvious reasons, could not have consulted the work of Diogenes Laertios.

Likewise Fehling's rejection of the historical existence of Leandr(i)os of Miletos, a local historian quoted by Kallimachos himself as the source for his version of the legendary contest (thus Diog. Laert. 1,28 = *FGrHist* 491-492 F 18), can be proven unfounded. The German scholar reached his conclusion on the strength of the same assumption that prompted him to discredit all of Herodotos' source citations: Kallimachos' *adagium* ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω (F 612 Pfeiffer I) was only the outcome of the literary device, employed by the *pater historiae* as well, whereby references to sources served as implicit declarations of obvious inventions[9]. Fehling, now, was undoubtedly right to stress that the context of the oft-cited Callimachean motto "I sing nothing that is unattested" eludes us. However, this observation hardly provides sufficient ground to support the claim that what "the ever playful" Kallimachos really wanted to convey through that phrase was "πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί", especially as modern scholarship, over the past few decades, has become increasingly aware of the essentially derivative nature—so typical of a bookish milieu like the Alexandrian intellectual scene—of a great deal of the literary production at the *Museion* in general[10]. Seen in this light the many references in the extant fragments of Kallimachos (from his scholarly and poetical works alike) to local historians such as Leandr(i)os cannot simply be dismissed, *pace* Fehling, as manifestos of so many inventions—the more so because their existence is invariably attested by independent sources[11].

---

[7] Fehling (1985: 33 n. 55): "Eusebius mit Beziehung zu 1,116 (und 1,119 wird Andron zitiert)."

[8] See the commentary on F 3, p. 150-151.

[9] Cf. Fehling (1985: 23-24 + n. 28).

[10] On this particular feature of Alexandrian literature in the early Hellenistic Period, see Pfeiffer (1968: 102-103); Fraser I (1972: 777-784); Bing (1988 *passim*); Cameron (1995: 24-25); Schepens – Delcroix (1996: 382-390).

[11] Two examples will suffice here: for Leandr(i)os of Miletos, cf. *FGrHist* 491-492 F 10-17; 19; for Xenomedes of Keos, whose local chronicle was quoted in the *Aetia* (III F 75,54-55 Pfeiffer I = *FGrHist* 442 F 1), cf. *FGrHist* 442 F 2-3. For an exhaustive enumeration of the many source references found in the remaining fragments of Kallimachos' paradoxographical treatise, see Schepens – Delcroix (1996: 383).

Apart from the observation made above, Fehling can be shown to be inconsequent in applying the principles he has laid down for himself. It is his firm belief that we know every single author active in the pre-Hellenistic period by name, through

In sum it would appear that the seven otherwise allegedly unidentifiable authors singled out by the German scholar as figments of Diogenes Laertios deserve a rehabilitation, or at least that a fresh investigation into their existence is called for[12]. At any rate, the historicity of an A. hailing from Ephesos who really did write a treatise entitled Τρίπους and who, among other things, discussed the Seven Sages and the Ἀγὼν σοφίας in it, can be vindicated.

The available evidence provides us with both explicit and implicit criteria for dating A. The most obvious clue is contained in F 3: the wider context of the *passus* reveals that it was derived by Porphyry from early Hellenistic sources, and this rough *terminus ante quem* can be made more precise in view of Theopompos' use of the Τρίπους, which places its author in the first half of the fourth century B.C.[13]. Furthermore, the underlying purport of the version of the legend of the Ἀγὼν σοφίας and the Prize for Wisdom recorded by Diogenes Laertios on the authority of A. would seem to hint at a very early date, as will be explained in the commentary on F 2[14]. Accordingly A. can tentatively be dated to the beginning of the fourth century B.C. As such A. should be distinguished from two more or less contemporary homonymic authors (both probably second half of the fourth century): A. of Halikarnassos wrote a work entitled Συγγενικά/Συγγένειαι or Ἱστορίαι, in which he dealt with the genealogical relations between the Greek tribes and cities[15], while A. of Teos (an officer under Alexander the Great) is credited with a Περίπλους[16]. In addition we know of a chronographer from Alexandria by the name of A., whose Χρονικά would appear to have been written in the first century B.C. at the latest[17]. On the attribution of those F which bear the name of A. without any distinctive element such as an ethnic or the title of a work

---

citations in the works of contemporaries or of Alexandrian scholars (cf. *supra*, p. 113-114); why, then, is Kallimachos' own acknowledgement of a predecessor, which happens to thwart the interpretation of Fehling, so casually dismissed?

[12] As it happens, there are at least two more trustworthy cases on Fehling's list of seven sources: on Alexon of Myndos, see Jacoby's *Nachträge* to his commentary on *FGrHist* 25 in *FGrHist* Ia, p. 548; on Phanodikos of Delos, see Jacoby's comments on *FGrHist* 397 (IIIb, p. 208-209—introduction—and 209-210—on F 4). For the rehabilitation by present-day scholars of Diogenes Laertios as a serious scholar who actually adopted the standard ancient practice of heuristics, cf. the *Preliminary observations* made above, p. 118 + n. 21.

[13] For a discussion of all of these elements, see the commentary on F 3; in addition, see the conclusion reached at the end of the commentary on F 5 (p. 157-158).

[14] Cf. *infra*, p. 138-140.

[15] See Schwartz (1894a: 2159-2160); *FGrHist* 10.

[16] See Berger (1894: 2160); *FGrHist* 802.

[17] See Schwartz (1894b: 2160); *FGrHist* 246.

(*FGrHist* 10 F 8-16), Jacoby has commented that there can hardly be any doubt about ascribing them all to the Halicarnassean, with possibly one exception[18]. In fact it will be argued below that there seem to be sufficient grounds for transferring *FGrHist* 10 F 9 to A. of Ephesos[19].

Setting out from the somewhat enigmatic title Τρίπους modern scholarship has almost unanimously assumed that A.'s work dealt exclusively with ancient tradition concerning the Ἀγὼν σοφίας or, by extension, with the cycle of legends on the Seven Sages in general[20]. To begin with, there can hardly be any doubt that the work was, indeed, not exclusively devoted to the legend about the contest among the Seven Wise Men, but must have concentrated on all members of the *collegium*: so much can be gathered from the fact that in A.'s account of the *Agon* only two members are directly involved (F 2a), while judging from F 1 and 2b he had a clear notion of the group as a whole. A close study of all of the available evidence, however, has brought to light the fact that scholars have hitherto concentrated too much on, and have consequently been led astray by, the three passages that relate directly to the subject of the Seven Sages. Firstly, there is no indication that A. regarded either Pythagoras or Pherekydes (or both) as members of the college, and the testimony contained in F 1 would actually seem to argue against this possibility[21]. More importantly, the topic discussed in F 5-6 has no bearing whatever on the Seven Sages: the invention of the Ionic script and the origin of the designation of the letters are topics in ancient literature completely separate from these figureheads of Greek culture, and hence another interpretation of the title Τρίπους is necessary.

Naturally any conjecture about the general purport of the work is bound to remain speculative in view of the limited number of F that have been preserved. Nonetheless, the combined evidence of all F, and especially the heurematological aspect conspicuous in F 5-6 and latently present in F 4[22], would seem to suggest that what A. wrote was actually an early form of cultural history of the Hellenic people.

---

[18] See Jacoby in his introduction to *FGrHist* 10 (Ia, p. 480): "über die zuweisung der zitate ohne distinktiv bestehen kaum zweifel (F 9?). sie gehören fast ausschließlich dem Halikarnassier."

[19] See the commentary on F 6, p. 158.

[20] The following list is long but hardly exhaustive: see Müller *FHG* II, p. 346; Kuiper (1916: 415); Barkowski (1923: 2244); Schmid – Stählin I,1 (1929: 374); Burkert (1972: 144); Schroeder – des Places (1991: 361 n. 8).

[21] See the commentary on F 3-4, p. 144-145.

[22] For the latter, see the commentary on F 4, p. 152-153.

Wholly in the spirit of the Greek tendency to attribute any given cultural or intellectual achievement to a single inventor, the πρῶτος εὑρετής[23], he would appear to have approached his subject in a highly personalized way: he studied cultural phenomena from a biographical, or rather anecdotal, perspective, surveying the whole pantheon of wise men (who were, essentially, the exponents of knowledge in early communities[24]), and awarded to each of those sages a τρίπους in return for their merits to Greek civilization, the tripod being, especially in early times, the coveted trophy in the many contests that took place across the Hellenic world[25].

Written in the fourth century B.C. A.'s Τρίπους does not seem to have enjoyed a long *Nachleben*: the extant F, though scarce, suggest that the work did not survive the early Hellenistic Period. Indeed, F 2a was possibly transmitted to Diogenes Laertios via Dikaiarchos or Hermippos, F 3 probably reached Porphyry via early third-century (B.C.) sources and F 5 seems to have passed via Theopompos; in addition, Diogenes Laertios clearly served as middle-man to later tradition as represented by F 1 and F 2b. The disappearance of the work is a loss to us, not least because A. is the earliest known written source for the miracle-stories about Pythagoras that circulated in antiquity (F 3).

---

[23] See KLEINGÜNTHER (1933).

[24] See KERFERD (1981: 24 + n. 1) with reference to earlier discussions of the subject.

[25] See the commentary on F 2, p. 138-139.

The only scholar who has previously come close to the interpretation of A.'s Τρίπους given above is WULF (1897: 172; 180-182); see especially his conclusion on p. 181: "Androni ille tripus, praemium sapientibus propositum, ad quemlibet virum sapientem quadrare, non cum constituto certo sapientium orbe coniunctus esse videtur; qua de causa illum librum, in quo de omnibus, quos nosset, sapientibus agere sibi proposuit, breviter τρίπους inscripsit, nihil aliud hoc verbo significans nise hoc fere: cui debetur palma sapientiae?"

We know of two other treatises entitled Τρίπους: on the one hand, DIOGENES LAERTIOS (10,14) refers to a work with this title by the Democritean philosopher Nausiphanes (born circa 360 B.C.; 75 A 6 p. 246,30 DK; B 1-4 p. 248-250 DK), on the other hand, Galenos in his *Subfiguratio emperica* p. 63,14 BONNET [cf. DEICHGRÄBER (1965²: 83)] quotes a Τρίπους of Glaukias the Empiricist of Tarentum. At any rate, the work of A. does not appear to bear any resemblance to these philosophical treatises. While the exact contents of the latter remains a matter of dispute, there exists a consensus among modern scholars that they should be related to Democritean teaching: see USENER (1887: 413-414); DEICHGRÄBER (1965²: 83; 267-258; 276-277); VON FRITZ (1935: 2023). In addition DIELS – KRANZ II (1952³: 248) compared them to Ion's philosophical work *Triad* (Τριαγμός), adopting the view that this was the same as the treatise of Ion referred to as Κοσμολογικός (for all texts pertaining to this matter, cf. *FGrHist* 392 T 3, F 24-26; T 8-9, 22a-c, F 114-118 LEURINI), but the suggestion that the *Triagmos* was a cosmological work has recently been challenged by FLORES (1991: 24-45); see also LEURINI (1992: 161-166; 186).

Commentary on the fragments

(1) In antiquity the Seven Sages' contemporaneity was as undisputed as their historicity. As a matter of fact, the entire complex of stories relating to their activities—especially the manifold legends about the Ἀγὼν σοφίας and their various gatherings (at *symposia* or elsewhere), and likewise the official proclamation by the Delphic priesthood of the Seven as Sages in their presence—was based on the assumption that all members of the *collegium* lived at (about) the same time. The present F shows clearly that the notion of the Sages' synchronism can be traced back at least to the time of A., and the famous Herodotean passage (1, 29) about the visit of the Greek σοφισταί to the court of King Kroisos might indicate that it was already current in the fifth century B.C.[26].

This contemporaneity of the Seven Wise Men came to be considered such a beacon in time that it acquired, at least from the end of the fourth century B.C. onward, the status of a veritable epochal date. Demetrios of Phaleron supposedly was the first to connect the group with a fixed date, the archonship of Damasias in 582/1 B.C.[27]. As far as we know A. had no chronographic interests, and so it would be rash to presume that he, working in the first half of the fourth centu-

---

[26] On this, see BARKOWSKI (1923: 2261); MOSSHAMMER (1976: 172). The contemporaneity of the Seven Sages was such a self-evident fact that one scarcely finds explicit statements on this topic in ancient literature; in addition to the F under discussion, cf. CIC. *De or.* 3,137: *septem fuisse dicuntur uno tempore qui 'sapientes' et haberentur et vocarentur.*

[27] Cf. DEMETRIOS OF PHALERON *ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 1,22 (= *FGrHist* 228 F 1 = F 149 WEHRLI IV): Καὶ πρῶτος σοφὸς ὠνομάσθη (*sc.* Θαλῆς) ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Δαμασίου, καθ' ὃν καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ σοφοὶ ἐκλήθησαν, ὥς φησιν Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ. JACOBY (1902: 182-183; see also 1947: 21 + n. 25) has further argued that Demetrios' date became the first chronographic standard until it was superseded, in Hellenistic times, by a more precise computation by the chronographer Apollodoros of Athens, this being 585/4 B.C., the year of Thales' *akme*. In more recent times, however, it has been stressed that there is no evidence to the effect that Apollodoros actually changed the date given by Demetrios; Jacoby's fault lay in assuming that in the Apollodoran chronological system Thales' *akme* coincided with the epoch of the Seven Sages, whereas the extant texts would seem to suggest that the chronographer preferred a date for the naming of the Wise Men that coincided with the acme of none of them: this is the view of MOSSHAMMER (1979: 269), whose refutation of Jacoby met with the approval of FEHLING (1985: 98 n. 220).

However, this is as far as the two scholars agree on this issue. For Mosshammer's own theory, see below, p. 135-136. FEHLING (1985: 97-104) again holds a maverick position in the debate: he has claimed that Aristotle and not his pupil, Demetrios of Phaleron, was the first to connect the absolute date of 582/1 with the Seven Sages. Above, however, it has been argued that Fehling's reconstruction is not exempt from gratuitous conjecturing, despite his professed dislike of such reasoning: see p. 116-117 + n. 17.

ry[28], would already have established an absolute date (let alone an Olympiad[29]) for the Sages.

At the same time, however, modern scholarship is prepared to accept that the Ephesian author did not simply adopt the mere contemporaneity outside a specific time-frame (such as we find it, for instance, in Plato's *Protagoras*), but put forward a relative date. Jacoby[30] deemed it "possible and even probable that A. mentioned the Lydian king at whose court they (*sc.* the Seven Sages) met"[31]. Recently Mosshammer has presented a more elaborate case[32]. The main thrust of his argument is that as early as the first half of the fourth century B.C. at least a relative date had been established for the Seven Sages, which Demetrios of Phaleron subsequently went on to refine. The clue to this for Mosshammer is the fact that in later chronographic tradition—the popular Olympiad chronicles that were used by and can still be grasped through the extant works of Clemens of Alexandria, Tatianos and Eusebios[33]—the epoch of the Seven Sages was consistently placed in the fiftieth Olympiad (580/77), whereas the archonship of Damasias coincided with the third year of the forty-ninth Olympiad. Starting from this observation, and combining it with the fact that Clemens of Alexandria always mentions the later

---

[28] As has been argued above, p. 131.

[29] BARKOWSKI (1923: 2261) was jumping to conclusions when he wrote that "Andron *ap.* Clem. 1, 19,129" assigned the Wise Men to the fiftieth Olympiad: dating by Olympiads was only introduced about the time of Andron, and strictly in scholarly circles—the lists of the victors at the Olympic Festival were first published circa 400 B.C. by HIPPIAS OF ELIS (*FGrHist* 6 F 2 = 416 T 3)—, so it is most unlikely that the Ephesian would have used it in his Τρίπους. By way of comparison, it may be noted that Ephoros in all likelihood did not date the Seven Sages by means of Olympiads either, but named them as contemporaries of King Kroisos instead (cf. EPHOROS *ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 1,40 = *FGrHist* 70 F 181; cf. also DIOD. 9,2; 25-28; DIOG. LAERT. 1,67; 81; 99; 105).

[30] JACOBY (1947: 21 n. 25).

[31] It should be pointed out, however, that none of A.'s F refers to a general meeting of the Seven at the court of a Lydian king; also, unlike his contemporary EUDOXOS OF KNIDOS (*FGrHist* 1006 F 1), for instance, Andron did not connect the Ἀγὼν σοφίας with King Kroisos (cf. F 2). But then again, given the precarious state of our knowledge of the Τρίπους, this *argumentum e silentio* hardly counts as a decisive objection to Jacoby's assumption: since the discovery of *PSI* IX, 1093—on which, see SNELL (1966: 115-118)—we know that the tradition of the *symposium* goes back at least to the fifth century B.C., and thus A. could have staged such a meeting at a royal court after all in some lost part of his work.

[32] See MOSSHAMMER (1976: 171-178) and ID. (1979: 267-270).

[33] Cf. CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* 1, 14,65.1; 1, 21,129.3 (after which the F under discussion follows); TAT. *Or. ad Graec.* 41; EUSEBIOS in the list of Olympic victors (*Chron. aram.* p. 93 KARST) and in both versions of the *Chronicle* proper: EUS. *ap.* HIER. *Chron.* p. 101b HELM (cf. SYNKELL. 453,14-15); EUS. *Chron. aram.* p. 187 KARST.

date (580/577) with reference to a fourth-century writer (A. and Eudemos of Rhodos), Mosshammer has suggested that the different Olympic dates did not arise from careless copying[34], but reflect two separate although connected traditions. His conjecture in three steps was that the dating of the Seven Sages to the fiftieth Olympiad derives from a relative chronology, according to which Thales and the Seven Sages had lived about a hundred years before the Persian Wars, and that Demetrios would have connected this relative date (a mere rough estimate) with the closest significant event, namely, the institution of the Pythian Games at Delphi which allegedly had taken place in the archonship of Damasias[35]; the latter point in time became the chronographic standard, but the earlier, approximate relative date somehow continued to circulate and was eventually converted—by the "popular Olympiad chroniclers" who served as sources to Clemens, Tatianos and Eusebios—into an absolute date corresponding to the first year of the fiftieth Olympiad. Accordingly, Mosshammer considered A. as a representative of the early fourth-century assumption that the era of the Seven Sages occurred some hundred years before the Persian Wars.

Attractive though the American scholar's suggestion certainly is—as already stated above, it does not seem too far-fetched to postulate a relative date for the contemporaneity of the Seven Sages—, it remains nonetheless hypothetical. Firstly, there is no evidence that the notion of a century had any meaning to the Greeks, or that they would have calculated as far back as a hundred years *before* the Persian Wars[36]; on the contrary, they usually counted the years *after* a fixed point in time or *between* two important events, such as the Sack

---

[34] As Fehling (1985: 98 n. 220)—not surprisingly—held.

[35] The dating of the establishment of the Pythian Games to the archonship of Damasias is attested in the *Marmor Parium* (cf. *FGrHist* 239 F 1, A 38). Fehling (1985: 21, 98-99) was undoubtedly right in supposing that the event was dated to that year by Demetrios' teacher Aristotle, who was epigraphically honoured (*SIG*[3] 275 = Tod *GHI* 187) for having drawn up the list of Πυθιονῖκαι [on this work, a joint effort with his relative Kallisthenes, see Robertson (1978: 54-60); Blum (1991: 23-24)]. At the same time, however, it is jumping to conclusions to claim—as did Fehling—that Aristotle linked this date with the Seven Sages on his list of victors.

[36] By Mosshammer's own admission (1976: 172 n. 23), this is the weak point in his reconstruction. The only parallels he can muster to substantiate his claim about dating backwards from an event are Herodot. 2,53 (an instance of reckoning "four-hundred years to our own times") and Thuk. 1,18 (where mention is made of the span of "four-hundred years or a little more" between the end of the Peloponnesian War and the institution of the Lycurgan constitution at Sparta—in Mosshammer's words, a case of going back to "a fixed terminus within historical memory"). At least in the latter case, though, Thukydides clearly starts counting from the earliest date onward, not backwards from the end of the 'Great War'.

of Troy or the return of the *Herakleidai*. As things stand, therefore, it is impossible to settle the matter in favour either of Jacoby's or of Mosshammer's proposal (and the door cannot be closed on other theories, either). Hence, the text of the F under discussion as given by Müller should remain unaltered: there are insufficient grounds for supplementing it with the Olympiad dating which the citation from A. was tacked onto by Clemens (and which even according to Mosshammer's theory only amounts to a later development of the original statement in the Τρίπους).

(2) Irrespective of all possible variations in regard to detail, there were two basic patterns along which the legend of the Ἀγὼν σοφίας was commonly developed[37]. The first version states that a golden tripod was discovered under miraculous circumstances. An oracle was consulted to divine its purpose, and there then ensued a *migratio* of the prize for wisdom among all of the Seven Sages, each of them finding himself a less deserving recipient than the next and humbly passing the gift on. Ultimately the seventh and last member of the *collegium* sacrificed the trophy to Apollo in one of his sanctuaries (those in Delphi and Didyma being most popular)[38]. According to the second version a single person dedicated a precious artefact (a tripod or drinking-cup, preferably—again—in gold) to "ὁ σοφώτατος τῶν Ἑλλήνων". This act was also followed by the circulation of the prize among each of the modest Seven Wise Men until, finally, it was either offered as an anathema to Apollo or remained in the hands of the final receiver by appointment of the god of wisdom himself[39].

The version of the legendary *Agon* which is reported here on the authority of A. is singularly different from these standard accounts in all but one aspect. Here, the entire people of Argos organizes the contest and donates the "prize for virtue". There are only two victors, as the trophy is passed on just once (the other members of the *collegium* appear to have been effectively beaten in the contest), and the second recipient evidently—that is, if the information provided by

---

[37] For modern discussion of the various ancient traditions, see Wulf (1897: 173-216); Kuiper (1916: 414-420); Barkowski (1923: 2248-2251); Wiersma (1934: 150-154); Segonds (1982: 170-171; 180-181), who concentrates on traces of Greek tradition in Arabic literature (derived from Porphyry); Fehling (1985: 25-39).

[38] Cf. Diod. 9,3; 9,13.2; Val. Max. 4,1 ext. 7; Plut. *Sol.* 4,2-7; Diog. Laert. 1,27-28; 1,31-33; 1,82-83; Ausonius *Ludus septem sapientium* 165-174; Schol. vet. Aristoph. *Plut.* 9c p. 9 Chantry; Schol. rec. Aristoph. *Plut.* 9a p. 5-6 Chantry.

[39] Cf. Kallimachos F 191, 32-77 Pfeiffer I; Plut. *Sol.* 4,8; *Sept. sap. conv.* 155e; Diog. Laert. 1,28-30; Athen. 11,495d.

Diogenes is complete—did not decide to sacrifice it to Apollo. The single motif, known from the more common stories, which also recurs in A.'s account, is the self-effacing state of mind of the initial recipient, who immediately steps aside for somebody else whom he regards as superior to himself.

The latter point notwithstanding, it is clear from the many unusual ingredients which go to make up this particular version that its underlying purport is essentially different from that of the more conventional variants of the legend. Whereas the latter showcase the good will and modesty of the truly wise person[40], the former exhibits the agonistic mentality which is so archetypally Hellenic and which only celebrates the best of its kind. The inevitable question that thus arises is the mutual relationship of the various branches of tradition: is that represented by A. a reactionary departure from the more established, fully developed ones, or does it afford us a glimpse of the tradition in its original unadorned form, before it was elaborated and embellished?

The nature of the Prize for Wisdom presented in the various stories may be taken as the starting-point for the following discussion. It has already been stated above that two kinds of prize were known: the tripod and the drinking-cup, usually made of gold. According to Wiersma the version involving the bowl was older than that involving the tripod. To a certain extent this stands to reason: it could be argued that the tripod-version is more likely to be the later one, which was developed as the Delphic priesthood took full control of the legend of the Seven Sages and tried to mould it on its own patterns. Plausible though this explanation may seem, however, it is not fully convincing. At the beginning of this century it had already been remarked that a tripod need not necessarily point to a Delphic connection, as a tripod had from early times been been a highly-prized ἆθλον ἀγῶνος awarded in various competitions[41]. Indeed in the Archaic Period even tripods not made of gold were considered valuable objects[42]. Now, as mentioned above, the agonistic element prevails in A.'s story, and so it strikingly resembles such an archaic contest in which a tripod—and Diogenes does not even report that it was made of gold—was the big trophy. Accordingly there is a strong case

---

40 This particular characteristic was already recognized in antiquity: cf. VAL. MAX. 4,1 ext. 7; PLUT. *Sol.* 4,2. In modern literature, see BOHREN *ap.* WULF (1897: 200 n. 1); WIERSMA (1934: 152).

41 See KUIPER (1916: 415).

42 See REISCH (1905: 1684-1685).

for arguing that A.'s version harks back to the earlier, more primitive stages of the tradition.

Two additional considerations reinforce this impression. Firstly it should be noted that only two members of the *collegium* are mentioned as prize winners, thereby implying that the other five were actually beaten in the contest. Of course it is more natural to assume that the legend of the Ἀγών was gradually expanded to incorporate all members of the *collegium* of Seven Sages, rather than that somebody would have devised a simple version in reaction against one involving all seven of them. Secondly, the link with Apollo is totally absent from A.'s version. At the end of last century it was remarked already that the Greeks are unlikely even to have thought about removing the god of reason and culture from the story once he had been introduced into it[43]. Correspondingly any story in which Apollo fails to play any part is almost bound to date from the formative phases of the tradition. To sum up: it may well be that A.'s story goes back to the earliest phase of the legend concerning the Ἀγὼν σοφίας[44] (without suggesting, of course, that there ever really was a historical contest).

The next question is exactly why A., who was aware of the *collegium* as such (*cf.* F 1), has not recorded the tale of the full-blown *migratio* of the Prize for Wisdom among all seven sages. One possible explanation is that he could not have known this particular version simply because it had not yet been invented at the time he wrote his version. Wulf, among others, defended this view and claimed inevitably that Eudoxos of Knidos, our earliest witness[45] to the *migratio* among the Seven Sages and in all likelihood a younger contemporary of A., must have been the inventor of this variant which eventually became the canonical account[46]. On the other hand, several scholars have stressed the unmistakably folkloristic and archaic nature of the legend not just in regard to the Seven Sages in general, but also with respect to the contest for wisdom[47]. This was seen above to be a trait of A.'s account as well. Accordingly there seems to be little ground for denying that the *novella* of the *Agon* was considerably *older* than the early fourth century.

---

43 See Wulf (1897: 180).

44 So also Barkowski (1923: 2249).

45 The otherwise unknown Euanthes of Miletos (*FGrHist* IV A 2, 1018), quoted by Diogenes Laertios (1, 29) along with Eudoxos, is wholly and hopelessly out of time.

46 See Wulf (1897: 199-201); in addition, see, for instance, Barkowski (1923: 2249).

47 See, among others, Wiersma (1934: 152); Wehrli (1973: 195).

The question remains, then, as to why A. recounted his peculiar version of the legend. We may attempt to find an explanation on the basis of the tentative early dating of A. to the first half of the fourth century[48]. The available evidence suggests that the ultimately authoritative version(s) of the legend had yet to be acknowledged as such at that time: no less than three radically different accounts can be traced back to the fourth century in general[49]. Hence, it may be argued that certainly at the start of the century the legend still existed in its multiform guise, none of the various stories having yet attained the status of a standard version, and that A. picked his particular account for reasons which, given the precarious state of preservation of his work, must elude us. As an added bonus the purport of A.'s version of the tradition of the *Agon* may suggest that he is to be dated as far back as possible in the fourth century B.C.[50].

The Aristodemos of Sparta (the expression Ἀριστόδημος Σπαρτιάτης is strikingly repeated in both passages) included by A. among the Seven Sages cannot be identified with any of the other known bearers of the name (even though many of them also originate from Sparta) in view of the fact that he was a contemporary of Chilon (indicated explicitly in F 2a) and the other members of the *collegium* (*cf.* F 1), and hence lived in a different time from that of any of his namesakes. In fact he had sunk into near-total oblivion even in antiquity: in addition to the data contained in the two passages under discussion here, only one further piece of information can be gleaned from the rest of ancient literature, and its nature is apophthegmatic rather than biographical. The following quotation is from Diogenes Laertios (1,31), where it is recorded that Alkaios cited Aristodemos in two of his verses:

> Μέμνηται τοῦ Ἀριστοδήμου καὶ Ἀλκαῖος (F 360 LOBEL-PAGE) οὕτως·
> ὣς γὰρ δή ποτ' Ἀριστόδαμον φαῖσ' οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον ἐν Σπάρτᾳ λόγον
> εἴπην· χρήματ' ἄνηρ, πένιχρος δ' οὐδ' εἷς πέλετ' ἔσλος <οὐδὲ τίμιος>[51].

---

[48] Cf. supra, p. 131.

[49] In addition to A.'s, see the accounts of EUDOXOS (*FGrHist* 1006 F 1), LEANDR(I)OS (*FGrHist* 491-492 F 18; cf. KALLIMACHOS F 191 PFEIFFER I) and THEOPHRASTOS (PLUT. *Sol.* 4,7 = T 583 FORTENBAUGH ET AL.).

[50] So also WULF (180-181).

[51] These lines, and the apophthegm cited in them, are repeated three more times in the extant literary sources from antiquity: cf. *Suda* X 477 *s.v.* χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ; SCHOL. PIND. *Isthm.* 2,17 p. 215-216 DRACHMANN III (through which the last two words can be added to the quotation as given by Diogenes); ZENOB. 6,43 p. 173 LEUTSCH – SCHNEIDEWIN I. In addition, there is a veiled reference to the saying (but not the Alcaean verses) in PINDAR's second Isthmian Ode (2, 15-18).

(*Alkaios mentions Aristodemos thus:*
Surely no witless word was this of the Spartan, I deem,
"Wealth is the worth of a man; and poverty void of esteem.")

Judging from the introductory words to this *passus*, it was recognized in antiquity that the unspecified Aristodemos "who spoke no insensate word at Lakedaimon" was the same person as the Spartan who was included by A. among the Seven Sages[52]. As it is, there can hardly be any doubt about that identification: the memorable saying quoted by Alkaios makes its originator a worthy representative of the same Laconian βραχυλογία used by Plato in his *Protagoras* (343a) as the criterion by which to designate the Seven Sages. In yet another respect Alkaios' verses and the apophthegm contained in them are particularly revelatory: it appears that the said Aristodemos was already well-respected for his sagacity by the end of the seventh century—his case is thus strikingly similar to that of the equally obscure Myson of Chen, who was known as a wise man as early as the time of Hipponax of Ephesos and who featured in the composition of the *collegium* as given, for instance, by Plato and Eudoxos of Knidos[53].

---

[52] The only scholars who have suggested a different identification for the Aristodemos cited by Alkaios are Kuiper (1916: 415-416) and Farnell *ap.* Privitera (1982: 159). The latter apparently tried to reconcile the accounts of Pindar and Alkaios by making Aristodemos an Argive who made his succinct statement on the frailty of human fortune whilst staying in Sparta. Bury (1892: 41), however, had already pointed out that according to the Pindar-scholiast the Boeotian poet may well have used Ἀργείος here in the sense of Homer's Ἑλένην Ἀργείαν (cf. *Il.* 2,161), " Ἀργεῖος being practically equivalent to Peloponnesian"—a possibility which is also acknowledged by Privitera (1982: 159) and which renders Farnell's effort unnecessary. Kuiper seems to have been aware of this unusual meaning of the ethnic: departing from Pindar's verses—where the originator of the apophthegm remains unnamed but is designated as an Ἀργεῖος—and from Alkaios' own lines—where Aristodemos is 'merely' said to have spoken his famous word ἐν Σπάρτῃ—the Dutch scholar proposed (with reference to Polyb. 4,33 and Diog. Laert. 1,94) to identify the said Aristodemos as an Arcadian king who reigned together with his father Aristomenes (*sic*) at the time of the Second Messenian War and who lost everything due to his father's betrayal of the Messenians in the so-called Battle of the Trench against the Spartans. Regardless of the disturbing confusion over the father's name (it should be Aristokrates, not Aristomenes, the legendary hero of Messenian resistance), however, Kuiper's conjecture, too, rather seems to be no more than a purely academic exercise: it has just been shown that ' Ἀργεῖος' was a rare yet acceptable synonym for 'Peloponnesian' in poetry [for a suggestion as to why Pindar used it in this instance, see Bury (1892: 41-42)], and Alkaios could have chosen to use the expression ἐν Σπάρτῃ instead of Σπαρτιάτης or Λακεδαιμόνιος for metrical reasons, so there is no need to question the identification accepted in the Laertian passage quoted above.

[53] On Myson of Chen and the Hipponactean verses in question (F 65 Degani), see the commentaries on Eudoxos (1006 F 1), Euthyphron of Pontos (1007 F 1) and Hermippos of Smyrna (*FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 19).

The connection with Alkaios prompted Kindstrand[54] to conjecture that Aristodemos "originally belonged to [the] group [of the Seven Sages] in different versions only to be replaced by other, better known characters later[55]." If this is accepted, however, and if it is agreed that the tradition concerning the Seven Sages was no fourth-century invention but harked back to the sixth and fifth centuries[56], serious doubts are cast on the possibility—pointed out by Kindstrand[57]—that A. was responsible for introducing Aristodemos among the Seven Sages. After all, the Ephesian can tentatively be dated to the first half of the fourth century[58], which would seem to be rather too late for being credited with such an intervention. Instead, it seems preferable to assume that A. derived his information about Aristodemos as one of the Seven from an existing tradition.

Two more issues call for investigation here. Given the proximity of the Alkaios-citation to A.'s F 2a in Diogenes Laertios, one might be tempted to believe that these verses were ultimately derived from the Τρίπους, just as the preceding story about the prize for wisdom. This matter can be linked to the problem of A.'s *Nachleben*; more specifically, the question here is whether the Ephesian's work was still directly available to Diogenes, or whether we have to assume that he borrowed the relevant information about it from intermediary sources.

As it happens, we cannot categorically rule out the possibility that a copy of the Τρίπους was still in circulation about the third century A.D., but the odds are certainly against it, given the relative obscurity of both author and work. If we look for possible intermediaries, two names immediately spring to mind. Dikaiarchos of Messene (circa 300 B.C.) in all likelihood and Hermippos of Smyrna (second half third century B.C.) for certain wrote a monograph devoted to the subject of the Seven Sages, in which they both appear to have given an overview of the wide range of traditions, contemporary and older, regarding the subject[59]. Thanks to two quotations in Diogenes Laer-

---

54 KINDSTRAND (1981: 38).

55 In antiquity a suggestion of this kind was made in the case of Myson of Chen by ARISTOXENOS OF TARENTUM (*ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 1,108 = F 130 WEHRLI II; cf. *FGrHist* IV A 2, 1016), whose suggestion has won acceptance among modern scholars: see, for instance, BARKOWSKI (1923: 2243).

56 Cf. *supra*, introduction, p. 119.

57 KINDSTRAND (1981: 38 n. 18).

58 As argued above, in the introduction, p. 131.

59 The case of Dikaiarchos is discussed by WEHRLI I (1967[2]: 51-52 *ad* F 30-32)—see also the forthcoming commentary in *FGrHist* IV B; on Hermippos' Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν, see *FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 T 8; F 9-20.

tios[60] we know that part of their studies consisted of a survey of the different names (ten in Dikaiarchos, seventeen in Hermippos) of men who were at any time considered suitable for inclusion in the *collegium* of Seven Wise Men, and that they both listed Aristodemos among the various candidates. Of course, other writers besides A., whom we know nothing about any more, may well have reported the same tradition as he did, but the chance that either Dikaiarchos or Hermippos (or both of them) were aware of A.'s Τρίπους is very real, not in the least because they lived much closer in time to him[61]. Consequently, it is a reasonable supposition that one of them (if not both, given the Laertian's acquaintance with their respective works) provided Diogenes with the references to A.

In the light of the foregoing, and given the fact that Alkaios' poetry was widely admired and constantly referred to throughout classical antiquity[62], the origin of the quotation in Diog. Laert. 1,31 is bound to remain a mystery. It could be argued that Diogenes' intermediary found it in A. and transmitted it along with his peculiar version of the Ἀγών, but the case for that go-between having himself added the verses to the original report is just as plausible: it is, for instance, an established fact that Hermippos was not averse to citing literary texts with a biographical angle to them[63], while Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai* contains several quotations from what must have been an exegetical commentary on Alcaean poetry by Dikaiarchos[64]. That Diogenes Laertios was the first to connect the Aristodemos as featured in the Alcaean verses with the homonymous Spartan mentioned in A.'s Τρίπους, seems only a remote possibility, the more so because the

---

[60] For Dikaiarchos, cf. Diog. Laert. 1,41 = F 32 Wehrli I; for Hermippos, cf. *FGrHist* 1026 F 10.

[61] A strong argument in favour of Hermippos as Diogenes' direct source on Andron would seem to be that author's predilection for citing little-known authors [there is a whole batch of them in the extant F: see chapter III.3 in Bollansée (1998)], but then again, all statements regarding Andron's fame (or lack thereof) in the fourth and third centuries B.C. are inevitably speculative (cf. F 3).

On the problematic nature of the assumption that Hermippos learnt the name(s) of (Andron and) Aristodemos from his predecessor Dikaiarchos, see the commentary on *FGrHist* 1026 F 10.

[62] For a discussion of the high standing of Alkaios' poems in the ancient world, a gauge of which is the number of quotations (for stylistic ornamentation and/or scientific and historical purposes) in the works of a great variety of authors active from the fifth century B.C. to the second century A.D., see Martin (1972: 112-125). Also interesting in this respect (though much more limited in scope) is the chapter "Vermutungen zur Alkaios-Überlieferung im 6. und 5. Jh." in Rösler (1980: 91-106).

[63] See chapter III.3 in Bollansée (1998).

[64] Athenaios gives the title of the work as Περὶ Ἀλκαίου: cf. F 94-99 Wehrli I.

only other quotation from Alkaios in the *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* also occurs in the first book and likewise concerns one of the Seven Sages[65]: this could easily be construed as implying that Diogenes did not know Alkaios' poems directly, but found both quotations in a predecessor's work devoted, like his own Book 1, to the legends concerning the Seven Wise Men[66].

However that may be, there are very good reasons for stating that at least the Pindar-scholiast is bound to have derived his information directly from Diogenes Laertios. The first clue is the occurrence of the Alkaios-quotation both in Diogenes' work and in the same scholium that spawned F 2b; secondly, it has already been remarked above that the formulation Ἀριστόδημος Σπαρτιάτης is strikingly common to both passages. It is for this reason that both passages have been placed together here under the same number.

(3-4) In view of the synchronicity with Thales posited for all Seven Sages by A. in F 1, Corssen[67] insisted that the author of the *Tripod* could not have dealt with either Pythagoras or Pherekydes within the context of the *collegium* of Seven Wise Men. Historically speaking, the argument is as sound as a bell: the *akmai* established for Pythagoras (second half of the 6th century B.C.)[68] and Pherekydes (544/1 B.C.)[69] do not accord with the traditional date of 582/1 for Thales' prime. On the other hand, it could be objected that this is hardly a conclusive argument, since many authorities in antiquity had only a vague sense of chronology and since a difference of (half) a century was usually unproblematic with the ancients if they were intent on bringing two figures together. In fact, there were writers who pushed Pythagoras' date far up into the sixth or even into the seventh centu-

---

[65] Cf. Diog. Laert. 1,81, where the Laertian reports and comments on various depreciatory epithets applied to Pittakos by Alkaios.

[66] Still, it is a remarkable fact that the Alkaios-verses on Aristodemos, dating from the end of the seventh century B.C., have been quoted or referred to three more times in antiquity, but always by authors *post*dating the Laertian: see the references given above, p. 140 n. 51. Totally ignoring these later quotations, Martin (1972: 120-121) conveys the impression that in his opinion Diogenes Laertios was familiar with Alkaios' work. But then again, the American scholar does not deal explicitly with the question whether the Laertian knew the Lesbian poet directly or not, so he may not have given the matter much thought.

[67] Corssen (1912: 35). See also Barkowski (1923: 2244), who does not give any arguments in support of his view.

[68] Burkert (1972: 110-111).

[69] Schibli (1990: 1-2).

ry[70]. Still, it will be shown below that A. knew his archon years and was aware of certain chronological relations[71]. There is, furthermore, no external evidence for assuming that A. regarded either Pherekydes or Pythagoras (let alone both of them) as members of the Seven Sages. Admittedly, both names occur on Hermippos' list of seventeen sages who had, in earlier times, featured in the ever-changing configurations (round a fixed core) of the group of Seven Sages[72], and it has been argued above[73] that Hermippos might have learnt about Aristodemos' membership of the *collegium* through the work of A., but this hardly implies that the same goes for Pherekydes and/or Pythagoras. Likewise, there is no perceivable connection between A. and the other passages (mostly from late antiquity) in which either figure is associated with the Seven[74]. In sum, it can be concluded that A. did not necessarily regard Pherekydes and Pythagoras as members of the college[75].

(3) A direct parallel can be drawn between the F under discussion and Diog. Laert. 1,116-117: (116) Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ θαυμάσια λέγεται περὶ αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ Φερεκύδου). Καὶ γὰρ παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν τῆς Σάμου περιπατοῦντα καὶ ναῦν οὐριοδρομοῦσαν ἰδόντα εἰπεῖν ὡς οὐ μετὰ πολὺ καταδύσεται· καὶ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ καταδῦναι. Καὶ ἀνιμηθέντος ἐκ φρέατος ὕδατος πιόντα προειπεῖν, ὡς εἰς τρίτην ἡμέραν ἔσοιτο σεισμός,

---

70 Early sixth century: Eratosthenes *ap.* Diog. Laert. 8,47 (= *FGrHist* 241 F 11); second half seventh century: Plin. *Nat. hist.* 2,37; 36,71. See Burkert (1972: 110-111).

71 See the commentaries on F 4 and 5, p. 152-153 and 156-157 respectively.

72 Cf. Diog. Laert. 1,42 (= Hermippos of Smyrna *FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 10).

73 In the commentary on F 2, p. 142-143.

74 Pythagoras also appears on the list of twelve names of sages as reported by Hippobotos (cf. Diog. Laert. 1,42 = F 6 Gigante); at Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 83, it is said that Pythagoras' oral instructions (the *akusmata*) are of the same class as the wisdom of the Seven Sages, but that the latter lived before Pythagoras. As for Pherekydes, there circulated in the time of Diogenes Laertios an obviously spurious exchange of letters between him and Thales of Miletos (cf. Diog. Laert. 1,43; 122); in addition, cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 14,59.5; Diog. Laert. 1,13; Theod. *Graec. aff. cur.* 5,63.

75 The two arguments given by Wulf (1897: 187-188) in support of this contention are ingenious, yet fail to surpass the purely conjectural. He claims, firstly, that A. would not have distinguished between Pherekydes the 'astronomer' and the 'theologian' (cf. F 4) if he had considered one of them a member of the Seven Sages (instead he would have used that epithet for the Pherekydes concerned). Secondly, he attempts to reconstruct the composition of the *collegium* of the Seven as given by A., but he does not manage to establish a watertight case against Pythagoras or Pherekydes: his inclusion of Myson as the seventh member (besides the fixed core of Thales, Solon, Bias and Pittakos—cf. Dikaiarchos *ap.* Diog. Laert. 1,41—and Aristodemos and Chilon from F 2) is not convincing.

καὶ γενέσθαι. Ἀνιόντα τε ἐξ Ὀλυμπίας εἰς Μεσσήνην τῷ ξένῳ Περιλάῳ συμβουλεῦσαι ἐξοικῆσαι μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων· καὶ τὸν μὴ πεισθῆναι, Μεσσήνην δὲ ἑαλωκέναι. (117) Καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις εἰπεῖν μήτε χρυσὸν τιμᾶν μήτε ἄργυρον, ὥς φησι Θεόπομπος ἐν Θαυμασίοις· προστάξαι δὲ αὐτῷ ὄναρ τοῦτο τὸν Ἡρακλέα, ὃν καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς νυκτὸς τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κελεῦσαι Φερεκύδῃ πείθεσθαι. Ἔνιοι δὲ Πυθαγόρᾳ περιάπτουσι ταῦτα [*Many wonderful stories are told about him (*sc. *Pherekydes). One day he was walking along the beach in Samos and saw a ship sailing by with a fair wind; he exclaimed that before too long it would go down, and down it went before his very eyes. As he was drinking water which had been drawn up from a well he predicted that on the third day there would be an earthquake, which duly happened. And on his way from Olympia he advised Perilaos, his host in Messene, to move away from there with all his possessions; but Perilaos could not be persuaded, and Messene was afterwards captured. He admonished the Lacedaemonians not to honour gold or silver, as Theopompos says in his* Mirabilia. *He told them he had received this command from Herakles in a dream; and the same night Herakles exhorted the kings to obey Pherekydes. But some assign these exploits to Pythagoras*]. The combined evidence of Diogenes' closing statement—ἔνιοι δὲ Πυθαγόρᾳ περιάπτουσι ταῦτα—and of Porphyry's more explicit testimony on A.'s and Theopompos' reports warrants the conclusion that both authors recounted the same body of (at least) four miraculous stories about their respective subjects, Pythagoras for A. and Pherekydes for Theopompos[76]. The quartet served to highlight the two luminaries' prowess as seers[77]. Firstly, it was said that Pythagoras at Metapontion and Pherekydes in his native Syros had successfully predicted, after a draught of water from a well, that an earthquake would take place within three days[78]. Secondly, both men are said, while standing on a beach, to have foretold the impending wreck of a

---

[76] For the attribution of the fourth story to Andron as well as to Theopompos, see also BURKERT (1972: 144 + n. 133); LÉVY (1926: 19-20), who briefly discusses the Eusebios-passage, does not refer to the parallel in Diogenes. In the light of the present F it is quite appropriate that Theopompos' treatment of Pythagoras and Pherekydes (cf. *FGrHist* 115 F 70-73) should have its place in book 8 of the *Philippica*, which contained a collection of *Mirabilia* [Θαυμάσια: cf. *FGrHist* 115 F 64-76; for this digression on wonderful things, see SHRIMPTON (1991: 15-21)].

[77] For a survey of the whole body of miracle-stories which circulated in antiquity about Pherekydes and Pythagoras alike, see VAN DER WAERDEN (1979: 51-63); BURKERT (1972: 141-147); SCHIBLI (1990: 5-11).

[78] There are several parallels for the story about Pherekydes containing minimal changes: APOLLONIOS (*Mir.* 5 p. 124 GIANNINI; cf. PARADOX. VAT. 30 p. 340 GIANNINI) places the action in Syros and MAXIMUS OF TYROS (13, 5) in Samos, while CICERO (*Div.* 1,112) and PLINY (*Nat. hist.* 2,191) do not designate the place. A general reference to Pythagoras' ability to infallibly predict earthquakes can be found at IAMBL. *Vita Pyth.* 135-136.

On the meaning of drinking the water, see BURKERT (1972: 145 + n. 135).

boat which they saw sailing by with a favourable wind, either in the waters near Megara Hyblaia (for Pythagaros) or off the Samian shore (for Pherekydes)[79]. Thirdly, Pythagoras at Sybaris and Pherekydes at Messene warned a friend (in Pherekydes' case, his host Perilaos) that his home town would soon be captured by its arch-enemy, events which in both cases occurred in due course. Finally, Pythagoras and Pherekydes alike preached abstinence from gold and silver to the Lacedaemonians at the instigation of Herakles, who had appeared to them in a dream and who visited the Spartan kings in like manner, urging them to obey the words of their venerable guests.

Judging from Diogenes' and Porphyry's words, the odd correspondence between the prophetic feats of Pherekydes and Pythagoras had been duly noted in antiquity. Most interesting is Porphyry's categorical assertion that A.'s version featuring Pythagoras was the original and that Theopompos shamelessly plagiarized it, changing the name of the protagonist and altering geographical details in a clumsy attempt to cover up the 'theft'. This is the reason why the Neoplatonist author comes to raise the matter and refer to A.: F 3 derives from a lengthy excerpt taken by Eusebios from the chapter *"On the Thievish Nature of the Greeks"* which was part of book 1 of Porphyry's *Lesson in Philology*[80]. The discussion of the topic is set at a dinner (the grammar-

---

[79] The version of this story featuring Pherekydes is also recounted in Apollon. *Mir.* 5 p. 124 Giannini. As for the Pythagoras-story, a passing reference, without any specific details, is made in Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 136. A variant of the latter can be found in a few later sources—Apollon. *Mir.* 6 p. 124 Giannini; Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 142; Porphyr. *Vita Pyth.* 28: the people of Metapontion eagerly await the freight from a boat coming into the harbour, but the cargo appears to be a human corpse, as predicted by the onlooking Pythagoras. *Pace* Corssen (1912: 34), there are no grounds for assuming that this account should be connected with Andron: in F 3 Porphyry unmistakably implies that the differences between the stories as related by the Ephesian and Theopompos only concerned the locations, hence Andron evidently did not mention the dead body (a similar impression is conveyed by the text of Diog. Laert. 1,116-117 quoted above). Thus, firstly, one has to assume that Porphyry drew on a different source for the version told in the *Vita of Pythagoras* [presumably Aristotle: see Burkert (1972: 142 + n. 123)]; secondly, it cannot be maintained that Andron's account was more moralizing and sensational than Theopompos and therefore, in all likelihood, a later development thereof [besides, Burkert (1972: 145 n. 139) has laid bare the fallacy inherent in this argument by pointing out that the story featuring the sinking ship could just as well be a cruder variant of the version with the boat carrying a single corpse on board]; thirdly, there is no demonstrable link between the miraculous stories reported about Pythagoras by Andron and by Aristotle: *contra* Corssen (1912: 32-36), see Burkert (1972: 145 + n. 139).

[80] *Cf.* Eus. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.1-26 (= 407T, 408-410F Smith); the title is referred to at the very start of the excerpt: Πορφυρίου Περὶ τοῦ κλέπτας εἶναι τοὺς Ἕλλήνας, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τῆς Φιλολόγου ἀκροάσεως. On this treatise, and particularly the chapter under discussion (the only remaining F), see Stemplinger (1912: 40-57); Ziegler (1950: 1979-1984); Beutler (1953: 288).

ian Apollonios cited at the beginning of the F is one of the interlocutors), and the first issue tackled by the banqueteers is the alleged superiority of Ephoros over Theopompos. In the course of the ensuing discussion the two reputed historians from the Isocratean school are both accused of a shocking lack of originality and branded "lazy plagiarists": Ephoros is said to have purloined no less than 3000 lines from his predecessors Daimachos, Kallisthenes and Anaximenes, while Theopompos is said to have made extensive but uncredited use of Isokrates' *Areopagiticus*, the work of A. and the *Hellenica* of Xenophon[81].

This matter is primarily worthy of attention within the context of the present investigation for the bearing it has upon the dating of A., which is a particularly problematic point. In fact, Theopompos is the only definite lead we have for establishing, however roughly, the period at which A. was active; especially if the chronological relationship implied in the allegations of plagiarism were to prove correct, A. could be situated at a fairly definite juncture in time. As it is, a number of scholars have, over the past century, thought about the case, but a lot of them have spoken out adamantly *against* the accuracy of Porphyry's claims: their main reason for doing so is that the anecdotes are more likely to have been taken from the lesser known Pherekydes and attributed to the more famous Pythagoras[82]. On the other hand, however, it could equally well be claimed that Theopompos, who emerges from one of his F as a rabid enemy of Pythagoras and Pythagorean doctrine[83], deliberately set out to transfer wondrous achievements of Pythagoras to his teacher Pherekydes[84]. The fact of the matter, sadly, is that too many *imponderabilia* shroud the issue in a thick mist. Even the internal evidence provided by the actual stories is of little help for solving the problem: as Burkert was right to stress, comparison of (historical and other) details yields no conclusive argu-

---

81 Cf. Eus. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.2-11 (= Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 T 17 = Theopompos *FGrHist* 115 F 70, 102, 345 = Porphyry 408F Smith).

82 Thus, for instance, Pédech (1989: 176 + n. 7); Shrimpton (1991: 17-18); Burkert (1972: 144 n. 131) cites older literature.

83 Cf. *FGrHist* 115 F 73 = Hermippos *FGrHist* 1026 F 27, with the respective commentaries.

84 So Burkert (1972: 145 + n. 138); Shrimpton (1991: 18), too, took this possibility into consideration, at the same time stressing, though, that "it is not clear whether Theopompos agreed with the sources who made Pythagoras a pupil of Pherekydes." About the presumed close relationship of Pherekydes and Pythagoras, see the commentary on F 4.

ment for the priority of either version because of the essentially legendary nature of all four tales[85].

Clearly, then, the matter is an intricate one. Yet some sort of valid conclusion would seem to be attainable after all, on the basis of an investigation into the reliability of the information provided by Porphyry. In this respect it is essential to distinguish two different *strata* in our source text. On the surface the full excerpt from Porphyry presents itself as an exposition on plagiarism and forgery in ancient Greek literature. When looked at as such, Porphyry, in the wake of his sources, cuts a poor figure and fails to stand the test as a trustworthy witness: a lot of the accusations can be dismissed offhand either as dictated by tendentious (if not downright hateful) faultfinding or as the work of a hypercritical sleuth who cannot tell shameless copying from complimentary citations, innocuous borrowing and independent parallels[86]. For instance, one can hardly attach complete credence to the statement that Ephoros lifted *verbatim* three thousand entire lines from the works of his predecessors Daimachos, Kallisthenes and Anaximenes, or that Menander wrote his *Deisidaimon* by simply transcribing from A to Z an existing play (the *Oionistes* of Antiphanes); furthermore, Theopompos' exact quotation from Isokrates' *Panegyricus* in the eleventh book of the *Philippica* must surely be interpreted as a respectful acknowledgement of a master by one of his pupils rather than as a reprobate act of pilfering[87]. Similarly, the

---

[85] On the one hand it could be argued that Pythagoras was scarcely associated with Sicily (let alone Megara Hyblaea) in older tradition, which Andron would necessarily have drawn on if priority is given to him; conversely, Pherekydes was only born *after* the fall of Messene, which is set at 600 B.C. at the latest in ancient tradition. See the pertinent remarks of BURKERT (1972: 145 + n. 136-139) on these and other points; on Pherekydes' date of birth and its chronological relationship to Sparta's reduction of Messene, see also SCHIBLI (1990: 6).

[86] This is the tenor of the final verdict passed by ZIEGLER (1950: 1991) on ancient κλοπή-literature in general—but Ziegler was also the first to admit that the excerpt from Porphyry preserved in Eusebios' *Praeparatio evangelica* is by far our principal source for the subject (perhaps in order to fend off charges of plagiarism against himself, Porphyry meticulously cited the names of the various predecessors he borrowed from while compiling his exposition), thereby recognizing the risk of ill-conceived generalizations. As a matter of fact, the section on Hypereides plagiarizing Demosthenes in a few of his speeches (EUS. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.15) has met with the approval of BLASS III.2 (1898^2: 55, 60-61).

[87] Cf. EUS. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.3 (= EPHOROS *FGrHist* 70 T 17 = DAIMACHOS *FGrHist* 65 T 1 = ANAXIMENES 72 T 28 = KALLISTHENES *FGrHist* 124 T 33); *Ibid.* 10,3.4 (= THEOPOMPOS *FGrHist* 115 F 102); *Ibid.* 10,3.13 (cf. ANTIPHANES p. 406 KASSEL – AUSTIN II; p. 82 KOCK II). See the remarks of ZIEGLER (1950: 1980-1981).

assertion that Theopompos himself forged the stories about Pherekydes by furtively appropriating and modifying A.'s anecdotes about Pythagoras, can hardly be taken seriously: a much more plausible explanation of the striking correspondence between the Chian historiographer and A. is that both authors drew on legends which predated their own time, circulated widely about reputed wonder-workers like their subjects[88] and, in the particular case of Pythagoras and Pherekydes, bore testimony to their interchangeability resulting from the close association—master-pupil relationship—that was assumed to have existed between them[89].

Stripped of its superficial layer of petty criticism and of generally rash or even hostile accusations of plagiarism, Porphyry's text can still be assessed in more general terms as a learned survey of some of the sources consulted by the Greek authors mentioned in it. Indeed, regardless of their ofttimes less than honourable intentions, it appears that the malicious ancient 'ferrets' proceeded most meticulously in their endless search for cases of alleged plagiarism[90]. In this respect, a considerable number of 'hits' seem to have balanced the inevitable misses which such a working-method entails. Two examples from Porphyry's chapter may suffice to illustrate this. A first case in point is that of Hekataios and Herodotos (Eus. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.16): while the exact extent to which the *pater historiae* drew on the geographer from Miletos (especially in ethnographical and geographical matters) can hardly be estimated, no scholar nowadays doubts the very indebtedness of the former to the latter[91]. Likewise, modern scholarship easily sees through the contrived charges of plagiarism raised in the lengthy section on Ephoros and Theopompos (Eus. *Praep. ev.* 10,3.2-11) and generally agrees that some degree of dependence of both authors on the respective names connected with them does exist. This confidence is primarily inspired by the actual discussion contained in the *passus*, a discussion which can be traced back to late third-century-B.C. author-

[88] A parallel that easily comes to mind is Empedokles. About this shaman-like mystagogue and wonder-worker, stories of actions verging on the magical and miraculous abounded: cf. Burkert (1972: 153-154); Wright (1981: 11-13); Chitwood (1986: 183-184). Prediction of an earthquake was also attributed to Anaximandros (cf. Cic. *Div.* 1,112; Plin. *Nat. hist.* 2,191).

[89] So, most recently, Schibli (1990: 6), but see also Ziegler (1950: 1981). This conclusion was already anticipated by the second-century B.C. compiler Apollonios, who remarked in his *Mirabilia* (6 p. 124 Giannini) that Pythagoras later in life τῆς Φερεκύδου τερατοποιίας οὐκ ἀπέστη.

[90] See especially Ziegler (1950: 1978-1979).

[91] See Schepens (1980: 36-38), who cites older literature; Lateiner (1989: 93-95); West (1991: 144-160).

ities and which is highly detailed and informed as well as informative[92]. Firstly, the correctness of the report on the various details recounted by Theopompos is vindicated by the matching parallel in the work of Diogenes Laertios, and the same holds, albeit indirectly, in the case of A. Secondly, mention is made by Porphyry of two writers—Daimachos and A.—who were, then as now, hardly household names but whose works could well have been known and available to his sources. It is, furthermore, very plausible that Ephoros, who has been acknowledged as the first ancient historian to abandon the Herodotean-Thucydidean concept of autopsy and to rely heavily on the writings of his predecessors[93], really did consult the works of Daimachos, Anaximenes and Kallisthenes (the list is by no means exhaustive!), just as there is nothing improbable about Theopompos having quoted Isokrates' *Areopagiticus* in his *Philippica*. Most interestingly, there is an important testimony linking an episode related in Theopompos' *Hellenica* (*FGrHist* 115 T 27 = F 21) to a passage from book 4 of the work of the same name by Xenophon: the reference can actually be verified (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4,1.29-40) and it sits comfortably with the present-day opinion that Theopompos (whose *Hellenica* like Xenophon's was conceived as a continuation from where Thucydides had left off) mined the work of his Athenian counterpart as a source for his own[94].

As stated above, this high degree of accuracy betrays the great amount of erudition involved in ancient κλοπή-literature. This, now, is surely an element which also influenced invented cases of plagiarism, for it should never be forgotten that such accusations only make sense and strike the reader as convincing if there is a minimum degree of plausibility[95]. In the light of this situation it is perfectly conceivable that one of Porphyry's (direct or indirect) sources[96] noticed the correspondence between A. and Theopompos, disposed of indications—irretrievably lost to us[97], but probably still available when the

---

[92] For the following, see Jacoby in his introductions to Daimachos *FGrHist* 65 (II C, p. 3-4) and Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 (II C, p. 24), as well as in his commentaries on 70 T 17 (II C, p. 37) and 124 T 33 (II C, p. 415); Ziegler (1950: 1980-1982); Shrimpton (1991: 186-187).

[93] See Schepens (1977: 102-106); Meister (1990: 89).

[94] See Meister (1990: 93); Shrimpton (1991: 12; 37); Schepens (1993: 186-187), discussing *FGrHist* 115 F 21.

[95] Compare what Burkert (1972: 227) has got to say about a similar case of alleged plagiarism.

[96] Which, as indicated above, might take us back to the early Hellenistic Period.

[97] Or maybe not: see the commentary on F 5, below, p. 157-158 + n. 125.

respective authors' works were still circulating intact—that the author of the Τρίπους was older than the famous historiographer from Chios and, hence, could easily manoeuvre the former into the position of a victim of the latter's 'kleptomania'. Therefore, regardless of the veracity of the actual accusations, the burden of proof would eventually seem to lie with those who seek to challenge the chronological relationship suggested by the F under discussion. Accordingly a date in the first half of the fourth century B.C. is on the cards for A.[98].

This early date would make A. an important witness to early literary tradition regarding Pythagoras, for reports on the "Samian sage" by fourth-century authors are very sparse indeed[99]. In fact his Τρίπους would even predate Aristotle's monograph *On the Pythagoreans*, in which the Stagirite collected the traditional and legendary materials regarding Pythagorean beliefs and practices (the principal themes being *mirabilia* and *acusmata*) in circulation in his own time but assumed to go back to much earlier times[100].

(4) The proposed split-up of Pherekydes of Syros into two individuals which is reported here on the authority of A. can be explained quite easily[101]. Judging from Diogenes Laertios (1,119) there appears to have been a local tradition on the island of Syros which credited Pherekydes, the famous author of a theo-cosmogonic myth variously entitled Θεολογία, Ἑπτάμυχος, Θεοκρασία and Θεογονία[102], with the invention of a solstice-marker (ἡλιοτρόπιον). It is not hard to see how

---

98 This was already the assumption of several scholars—see, for instance, MÜLLER (*FHG* II, p. 346); WELLMANN (1894: 2160-2161), BARKOWSKI (1923: 2244); JACOBY (1947: 24 n. 32); SHRIMPTON (1991: 17)—, but none of them bothered to substantiate this view. Only WULF (1897: 172-173; 180-182) did also come up with corroborative, albeit circumstantial, evidence, but via another way (see the commentary on F 2, p. 145 + n. 75).

99 See DILLON – HERSHBELL (1991: 6 + n. 24).

100 On Aristotle's monograph, see especially PHILIP (1963: 191-194; 197); VON FRITZ (1963: 242); BURKERT (1972: 166-170).

101 See JACOBY (1947: 24-25); SCHIBLI (1990: 5).

102 Since JACOBY (1947: 13-64) refuted the thesis that 'Pherekydes' was a collective name for all anonymous early Ionian prose-writing, it has been commonly accepted by modern scholarship [with the sole exception of the as yet unpublished dissertation by TOYE (1991)] that Pherekydes of Syros is to be distinguished from at least four other bearers of that name, the most famous of whom is the genealogist Pherekydes of Athens (*FGrHist* 3). On the mythographer and theogonist of Syros, see the recent monograph by SCHIBLI (1990). For the title of Pherekydes' cosmogony, cf. APOLLONIOS DYSKOLOS, *De pronominibus* 1,65.15-18 SCHNEIDER – UHLIG (F 70 SCHIBLI) and *Suda* Φ 214 *s.v.* Φερεκύδης (F 2 SCHIBLI). The *incipit* of the work has also been preserved: cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,119 (F 14 SCHIBLI), probably drawing (ultimately) on Kallimachos' *Pinakes*. On these issues, consult JACOBY (1947: 14 n. 6) and SCHIBLI (1990: 4-5).

an erroneous understanding of the *passus* from Homer's *Odyssey* (15, 403-404) in which mention is made of "the island Syrie (...) where the turnings of the sun occur", could prompt an ancient writer—Diogenes (or his source) seems to make A. himself responsible—to postulate a second Pherekydes of Syros: the similarity of the names of the islands and the obvious connection between the celestial phenomenon and the scientific achievement, on the one hand, and the ancients' irrepressible urge to attribute any long-established cultural realization to a πρῶτος εὑρετής[103], on the other, was an open invitation to this solution for the *heliotropion* in question[104].

As Jacoby[105] acutely observed, this faulty inference of A. is nevertheless important "in so far as it shows that even in the fourth century the theologian could not be dated earlier than the sixth century because as yet scholars did not like to assume pre-historic prose books." This inference would seem to hint at a keen chronological awareness on the part of A., as well as a budding (and so, inevitably, primitive[106]) critical reflection on existing traditions. All the same it appears that Eratosthenes' authoritative rejection effectively killed off the prehistoric doublet, which is not encountered anywhere else in our sources. Diogenes' wording actually suggests that Eratosthenes took issue with A.'s proposition and emphatically denounced its deficiency; correspondingly it is conceivable that the Laertian (or his direct source) came across A.'s name in one of the chronographical works of the Alexandrian scholar[107].

Pherekydes' main claim to fame in antiquity was that he was the very first Greek prose writer[108]. In addition, there was a widespread tradition according to which he was the teacher of Pythagoras, a relationship which in all likelihood was contrived on the basis of similarities in doctrinal matters (both men's teachings on the soul and on metempsychosis) and did not rest on actual and direct personal rapport. This tradition, which culminated in the stories about Pythag-

---

103 See Kleingünther (1933).

104 To A.'s credit it can be pointed out that Strabo was also misled by the likeness of the names Syros and Syrie, witness *Geogr.* 10,5.8 c. 487. However, while there is still some dispute as to the exact interpretation of the Homeric *passus* [see, for instance, Heubeck – Hoekstra (1989: 257)], it is certain that the Cycladic island was not meant by the great poet.

105 See Jacoby (1947: 25).

106 After all, a far easier way out of the chronological problem for A. would have been simply to deny any connection of the theologian with the *heliotropion.*

107 Ostensibly Jacoby (*FGrHist* IIB, p. 1015) was not sure whether to attribute the Eratosthenes-F under discussion to the Χρονογραφίαι or to the Ὀλυμπιονῖκαι.

108 See Jacoby (1947: 20 + n. 22); Schibli (1990: 3-4).

oras coming to Delos in order to assist his dying master and bury his corpse, has been surveyed comprehensively by Schibli in his recent monograph on Pherekydes[109]; the only noteworthy point here is that, in the light of the early date suggested for A. in the introduction to the F, the author of the *Tripus* is the earliest surviving witness to this tradition.

In the present state of affairs, it is difficult to make out whether the basic information contained in the F under discussion—the descent of Pherekydes[110] and the fact that he was Pythagoras' teacher—points to a cursory mention of Pherekydes in the extensive section on Pythagoras (cf. F 3) or whether Pherekydes received separate treatment in A.'s *Tripod*, on a par with the chapter on the Samian sage. The fact that A. distinguished between two bearers of the name Pherekydes might seem to favour the second possibility; on the other hand, we do not even know how A.'s work was laid out or in what context Pythagoras and/or Pherekydes were discussed[111]. Consequently a *non liquet* is in place here.

(5-6) While the attribution of F 6 alone could cause some problems, the joint evidence of both passages leaves little room for doubt that A. did indeed discuss the origin of the Greek (Ionic) alphabet in his Τρίπους. For the determination of the exact contents of the work as a whole these two F are, consequently, extremely important: they indicate in unmistakable fashion that the work did not deal exclusively with the legends surrounding the Seven Sages, as there is no indication whatever in ancient sources that those figureheads of Greek culture were ever associated with the invention or introduction of the Ionic script, nor is there any trace of them in the two F under discussion.

(5) Upon a cursory reading doubts might be raised about the ascription of the *passus* running from Τοὺς δὲ Ἀθηναίους to ἐπὶ Εὐκλέους: it was possibly derived from A., but could equally well go back to Theopompos, who is cited in the sentence that immediately follows and is inextricably linked to the *passus* under discussion. Judging from the available evidence, however, the unusual epithet πολυγράμματος ('deeply lettered') applied by Aristophanes to the people of Samos left the ancients very puzzled indeed, for several attempts at elucidation

---

[109] See Schibli (1990: 6; 11-13).

[110] On the origin and the geographical distribution of the name of Pherekydes' father, Babys, see Schibli (1990: 1 + n. 2).

[111] Cf. *supra*, p. 144-145.

are recorded in our sources[112]. Kallistratos' invention, now, is the starting-point for a verily tailor-made explanation which hinges on a direct personal relationship between the Samian and Aristophanes. The double reference, within the space of a few lines, to the otherwise obscure Kallistratos[113] lends the entire section a sense of unity which strongly suggests that all information contained in it goes back to one and the same author, who can safely be identified as A.[114].

Although the explanation given by A. is manifestly unhistorical—it clearly runs counter to the established view that the Greeks adopted the Phoenician script at some time between the 12th and 8th centuries B.C.[115]—and suspiciously appropriate, it nevertheless does not seem to be a ready-made invention on his part. In fact the story would seem to be rooted in a genuine tradition, for it can be related to two other passages which recount a similar story about the origin of the Ionic alphabet: in Hesychios' *Lexicon* we read that the Samians were the first of the Greeks to adopt the use of the twenty-four letters and to pass the custom on to the other Hellenes[116], and in a Homer-

---

[112] Basically two other explanations (transmitted with some variations) are provided in the ancient texts. According to ARISTOTLE in the *Constitution of the Samians* (cf. the text of the F under discussion), the label πολυγράμματος was given to the Samians after they had enfranchised their slaves (who bore brandmarks) for five staters, at a time when they were being oppressed by tyranny [on which KASSEL – AUSTIN III.2 (1984: 66) commented: "Aristotelis explicatio vix habet quo aut commendari aut refelli possit"]. According to various other sources (cf. PLUT. *Per.* 26,4; AEL. *Var. hist.* 2,9; *Suda* Σ 77 *s.v.* Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος ὡς πολυγράμματος; *Suda* T 142 *s.v.* Τὰ Σαμίων ὑποπτεύεις), the name was derived from an ugly episode in the Samian Revolt of 441-439, in which the Samians had branded Athenian prisoners of war with stigmata on the forehead by way of retaliation for the Athenians' having earlier marked their Samian captives in a similar manner (there is confusion in our sources as to which sign was used by which people). Since such incidents, though rarely attested in ancient sources (cf., in addition to the aforecited passages, HERODOT. 7,233.2; PLUT. *Nic.* 29,2), were not entirely out of place in ancient warfare—see DUCREY (1968: 214-215); PANAGOPOULOS (1978: 141 + n. 3); STADTER (1989: 249-250); SHIPLEY (1987: 117); PICCIRILLI in BERTINELLI – CARENA – MANFREDINI – PICCIRILLI (1993: 314)—the origin of the epithet used by Aristophanes may well lie here.

[113] See STÄHELIN (1919: 1735).

[114] This is also how KASSEL – AUSTIN III.2 (1984: 66) understand the passage, judging from their notes on Aristophanes' F 71; ditto for MÜLLER *FHG* II, p. 348 F 7 (see the Latin translation in particular). The way in which JACOBY has edited the *passus* under discussion for Theopompos (cf. *FGrHist* 115 F 155: only the two sentences about Archinos are quoted there) suggests that he, too, held the same view.

[115] On this issue, cf. *infra*, p. 159 + n. 131.

[116] HESYCH. ALEX. *Lex.* Σ 150 p. 8 SCHMIDT IV *s.v.* Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος (...) Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα ἱστορία, δι' ἣν πολυγράμματον ἔφη δῆμον· ἐπειδὴ Ἑλλήνων Σάμιοι πολυγράμματοι ἐγένοντο πρῶτοι καὶ χρησάμενοι καὶ δι(α)δόντες εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας τὴν διὰ τῶν κδ στοιχείων χρῆσιν.

scholium it is reported on the authority of Ephoros that Kallistratos of Samos passed the new system of writing on to the Peloponnesians and imparted it to the Athenians in the archonship of Eukleides[117]. If anything, this evidence indisputably attests to the existence, in antiquity, of a tradition—probably a local Samian one[118]—which accorded to the inhabitants of the Ionian island (continuously in the forefront of Greek civilization from the Archaic Period onward) a crucial part in the introduction of the Ionic alphabet into the Greek world.

Having said this, it appears upon close investigation that A.'s version does stand apart from the two parallels which, in turn, are clearly compatible with each other. On the one hand, there is the story that the Samians borrowed the alphabet from another source—through Ephoros' F 105 we know that he, like Herodotos, traced it back to the Phoenicians—and spread it across the Greek mainland; in this connection Ephoros specifically mentions the name of one Kallistratos. On the other hand, there is A.'s account, which also refers to a Kallistratos of Samos, but which is marked by two key differences: the said Kallistratos is put forward as the actual inventor of the new system of writing, while another person is credited with the dissemination thereof in Attica[119]. Correspondingly it is a reasonable conjecture that we have before us both the original, blatantly unhistorical and overtly patriotic form of the tradition and the re-adjusted one which at least respects the established historical facts.

In the light of the foregoing a glimpse can be caught of A.'s historical notions as well as of his method as a researcher and an author. It appears, firstly, that A. did not postulate a mythological inventor of the Greek alphabet but, in the Herodotean vein, adopted a historical theory[120]. Secondly, it can again be observed that A. had a clear

---

[117] Schol. Hom. *Il.* 7 185: Καλλίστρατος δὲ Σάμιος ἐπὶ τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν μετήνεγκε τὴν γραμματικὴν καὶ παρέδωκεν Ἀθηναίοις ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Εὐκλείδου, ὥς φησιν Ἔφορος (70 F 106). For a discussion of Ephoros' views on the origin of the Greek alphabet, see Schepens (1987: 318-319).

[118] The island had, from early on (fifth century B.C.), a rich tradition of local chronicles: see Jacoby in his introduction to the section on local histories from Samos (*FGrHist* IIIb, p. 455-456 + n. 11).

[119] On Archinos, the prominent Athenian politician from the second half of the fifth century B.C. who proposed to the *ekklesia* the decree about the official adoption of the Ionic instead of the Attic alphabet and who may also have written a short treatise on the subject in support of his case (cf. Theophrastos *ap.* Syrian. *Comm. in Met.* p. 191,29-192,3 Kroll; cf. T 681 Fortenbaugh), see Usener (1870: 590-592); Judeich (1894: 541); Kirchner (1901: 169) no. 2526; Develin (1989: 200); Traill (1995: 390-391) no. 213880; Meier (1996: 1002).

[120] On the ancients' theories concerning the origin of their alphabet, see the commentary on F 6, below, p. 159 + n. 131.

sense of chronology[121]: he was aware of the archon dates for his facts—presumably derived from Hellanikos' Ἀτθίς—and he made sure his account was sound by manipulating his evidence accordingly (*in casu* by contriving a personal relationship between Kallistratos and Aristophanes which predated the official introduction of the Ionic alphabet into Attica[122]). Thirdly and finally, it appears that, these positive assets notwithstanding, A.'s *Historikerqualität* cannot be esteemed highly. A comparison with Ephoros makes this especially clear. A. was informed of the tradition about the allegedly prominent part played by the Samians in the diffusion of the Ionic alphabet and reproduced the basic story essentially unaltered, changing it only in order to make the archon years fit in with it and to bring it into line with the point he intended to develop—and all this even though a serious writer like Herodotos (5,58) had already drawn attention to the pioneering role of the Phoenicians, and in spite of the fact that a late fifth-century date for the invention of the alphabet must have struck educated members of the public as dubious in the first half of the fourth century B.C. The difference with Ephoros is telling: the Cymaean historian, too, was aware of the 'Kallistratos'-tradition, but at the same time he sought to reconcile this datum with the Herodotean theory about the Phoenician origin of the Greek script, reducing the part of Kallistratos from that of inventor to that of intermediary. Of course, it should be stressed that we are groping in the dark about any pretensions A. may have made to accuracy or veracity, and hence this criticism may be unfair to him; nonetheless, his manipulation of current evidence cannot be overlooked.

A final word remains to be said about the short reference to Theopompos attached to the A.-F as outlined above[123]. Mention has already been made of the close link that binds the two quotations. In fact the wording of the entire *passus* conveys the inescapable impression that Theopompos' account was closely similar to that of A., but contained further information about the said Archinos who is said to have acquainted the Athenians with the Ionic alphabet: the repetition of the verb πειθεῖν is particularly significant in this respect, serving as

---

[121] This is consonant with the conclusion reached in the commentary on F 4, above, p. 153.

[122] Maybe A. arrived at this conclusion because an Athenian namesake of the Samian Kallistratos was actually recorded in the documentary sources as the χορηγός of the year 427/6 B.C.

[123] Regrettably I have not been able to consult HERZOG (1912: 27 n. 18), referred to by JACOBY in his commentary on 115 F 155 (IIC, p. 380), so I am not aware what the former has said about the *passus* under discussion and the place of Theopompos in it.

a *trait-d'union*. Especially in view of the conclusion reached at the end of the commentary on F 3 concerning the dates of A. and Theopompos[124], one might consequently venture with a degree of caution to think that A. was cited by the Chian historian as his main source on this particular issue, which he supplemented with information gathered from elsewhere[125].

(6) Apparently Jacoby had slight doubts about identifying the A. cited in this passage without ethnic or book-title as A. of Halikarnassos, the fourth-century (B.C.) author of a treatise Συγγένειαι[126]. As a matter of fact there are sufficient grounds for reconsidering the ascription of the F under discussion and attributing it to A. of Ephesos. For one thing, the assumption that the issue of the invention of the Ionic alphabet was dealt with in a work on the genealogical relations between the Greek tribes and cities, is anything but binding (hence, probably, Jacoby's own reserves). More importantly, it is highly plausible that F 5 and 6 derive from the same context[127], and one cannot lightly pass over the explicit reference in F 5 to Ἄνδρων ἐν Τρίποδι which is, moreover, coupled with a detailed quotation[128]. The confidence thus inspired receives a further boost in the light of the hypothesis, defended above, that the general title of A.'s work need not be restricted to the legend of the *Agon* of the Seven Sages, but might indicate a work conceived in celebration of the great cultural heroes of the Hellenic world[129]. As an *argumentum contra* it could be objected that A. would then have juxtaposed a mythological and a historical theory about the origin of the Greek script in one and the same work, but this consideration is hardly prohibitive: for all we know, A. may have reported several variant stories on the topic, surveying examples of both kinds of theories[130].

---

[124] Cf. *supra*, p. 151-152.

[125] Conversely, this conclusion would seem to provide proof positive that Porphyry's Hellenistic sources really did have incontestable proof that Andron was older than Theopompos and that the latter could easily be accused of having plagiarized the former's miracle-stories about Pythagoras (see the discussion above, p. 151-152)—but here, of course, we come dangerously close to begging the question.

[126] He edited the *passus* as *FGrHist* 10 F 9, commenting in his introduction to the author (*FGrHist* I a, p. 480): "über die zuweisung (*sc.* to A. of Halikarnassos) der zitate ohne distinktiv bestehen kaum zweifel (F 9?)"

[127] This was also assumed by MÜLLER (*FHG* II, p. 348).

[128] Surprisingly Jacoby does not even mention the parallel from the *Suda* recorded here as F 5.

[129] Cf. *supra*, p. 132-133.

[130] It is probably incorrect to suppose that A. would have differentiated between the Phoenician and Ionic alphabets, considering the former (invented by King Ak-

The origin of the Ionic alphabet was, indeed, a matter of much debate among the Greeks themselves and was explained in many different ways. Witness the complete *passus* from which the present F is derived (SCHOL. DION. THRAC. p. 182,15-186,4 HILGARD), the designation 'Phoenician' for the letters was all they could agree upon: starting from this point—an indication that some vague notion about the roots of their alphabet did subsist among the Hellenes—a whole gamut of explanations was offered, ranging from the learned and informed over the mythological and fabulous to the downright far-fetched and contrived (and even outlandish). Roughly speaking two distinct movements can be discerned: prior to Herodotos the invention of the phonetic system of writing was, as a rule, attributed to mythical heroes, while the *pater historiae* was the first to provide a historical theory (still mixed, admittedly, with what nowadays is considered legendary material), tracing the Greek alphabet back to a Phoenician original[131].

Obviously the story recapitulated in the F under discussion falls into the former category. A full version of the tale has been preserved in the *Suda*-lexicon, where it is recorded on the authority of Skamon of Mitylene "in the second book of his work *On Inventions*": Aktaion (or Aktaios), the legendary first king of Attica, had four daughters and no male descendants; when the youngest girl, Phoinike, died young, the monarch decided to call the letters he had invented 'Phoenician'

---

taion and named after his daughter in times immemorial) a primitive precursor of the latter (introduced into Samos in the second half of the fifth century B.C.): such a distinction has been upheld by some modern scholars who have debated the ancient evidence in general on the origin of the Greek script [on this, see EDWARDS (1979: 174-177)], but there is no evidence that the ancients already followed this train of thought.

131 Cf., in addition to the scholium on Dionysius Thrax cited above, AISCHYL. *Prom.* 468-469; HERODOT. 5,57-58; DIOD. 3,67.1; 5,57.5; 5,74.1; PLIN. *Nat. hist.* 7,192-193. For surveys and discussions of the ancient theories, see, among others, HOW – WELLS (1928²: 26-27); JACOBY in his commentary on 70 F 105-106 (IIC, p. 62-63); LEGRAND (1961²: 102 n. 4); VIRGILIO (1975: 81-84); ACCAME (1981: 9); BOMMELAER (1989: 106 n. 2).
In modern times the topic has, as a matter of course, attracted much attention. The Phoenician origin of the Greek alphabet goes undisputed nowadays, but the exact source of the alphabet, the route by which it reached Greece (was it taken home by Greek settlers and merchants visiting Phoenicia itself, or was it developed in some area of Phoenician culture, like Crete?) and the time at which this happened (suggestions vary between the 12th and the 8th centuries B.C., though even a date circa 1400 B.C. has been proposed) are still vexed questions; for a recent *status quaestionis*, see ISSERLIN (1991: 283-291); AMADASI GUZZO (1991: 293-311).

in her honour[132]. Unfortunately our knowledge of the said Skamon of Mitylene is poorer still than that of A.; if the fourth-century (B.C.) date suggested by Jacoby (on the basis of a tentative identification with the homonymous son of Hellanikos of Lesbos) is correct, he would belong to roughly the same period as A.[133]. Even so, it is impossible to make out who influenced whom, or whether both writers reported the same tradition independently. Likewise it is impossible to establish the relationship (if ever there was one) between A. and Menekrates of Olynthos, because the latter is not cited anywhere else in what has come down to us of ancient literature[134].

(7) The available manuscripts for this passage unanimously read Ἀνδρότιων, without any further specification. The only clue provided for the identification of this author is the designation of the Seven Sages as σοφισταί: until sometime towards the middle of the fourth century B.C. both terms were perfectly interchangeable, while afterwards the derogatory connotation which the label 'sophist' had gradually taken on since the end of the fifth century gained the upper hand and precluded further use thereof in the particular sense of 'wise man'[135]. The *terminus ante quem* thus obtained means that only one known bearer of the name Androtion qualifies for identification as the author referred to by Aristeides, namely, the famous Atthidographer who published his local history of Attica circa 340 B.C.[136]. Since the latter,

---

[132] Cf. *Suda* Φ 787 *s.v.* Φοινικήια γράμματα· (...) Σκάμων δ' ἐν τῇ δευτέραι τῶν Εὑρημάτων ἀπὸ Φοινίκης τῆς Ἀκταίωνος ὀνομασθῆναι· μυθεύεται δ' οὗτος ἀρσένων παίδων ἄπαις γενέσθαι· αὐτῷ θυγατέρας Ἄγλαυρον Ἕρσην Πάνδροσον τὴν δὲ Φοινίκην ἔτι παρθένον οὖσαν τελευτῆσαι· διὸ καὶ Φοινικήια τὰ γράμματα τὸν Ἀκταίωνα βουλόμενον τιμῆς ἀπονεῖμαι τῇ θυγατρί. On Aktaion/Aktaios, see WENTZEL (1893: 1209); TÖPFFER (1893: 1212).

[133] See JACOBY (1927: 437). Much less decided about the identity of Skamon: MÜLLER (*FHG* IV, p. 489-491); SUSEMIHL II (1892: 399 n. 314 on p. 400).

[134] Modern scholarship is completely at a loss how to identify this figure: see, for instance, MÜLLER (*FHG* II, p. 344); SUSEMIHL I (1891: 649 n. 685). Perhaps significantly, he is completely missing from Pauly-Wissowa's *RE*.

[135] For designation of (one of) the Seven Sages as σοφισταί, cf. HERODOT. 1,29.1 (cf. also 2,49.1); 4,95.2 (to the extent that Pythagoras counted as a member of the *collegium*); ISOKR. *Or.* 15, 235; 313; ARISTOT. in *Et. M.* *s.v.* σοφιστής p. 722,16-17 GAISFORD (F 5 ROSE = Περὶ φιλοσοφίας F 5 ROSS = F 871 GIGON); [DEMOSTH.] *Or.* 61,50; ARISTARCHOS *ap.* PLUT. *De frat. am.* 478b-c; PLUT. *De am. mult.* 96a; *De E* 385d-e; *De Her. mal.* 857f; IAMBL. *Vita Pyth.* 83. For the label σοφιστής applied to Sokrates by contemporaries, cf. AISCHIN. *Or.* 1,173 and possibly EUPOLIS F 388 KASSEL – AUSTIN V. On the original—neutral or even positive—denotation of the term 'sophist' and the subsequent shift in meaning it underwent, see UNTERSTEINER I (1961^2: XVI-XXIII); CLASSEN (1976: 1-4); KERFERD (1981: 24-41).

[136] For the crucial dates in Androtion's life and career, see JACOBY in his introduction to *FGrHist* 324 (IIIb, p. 87-93; 103 + n. 125); HARDING (1994: 13-25).

however, is not known to have dealt with the Seven Sages, Siebelis suggested changing the name to Ἄνδρων, implying that the Ephesian author of the Τρίπους must have been meant here by Aristeides. This emendation has met with mixed reactions from modern scholarship, ranging from circumspect acceptance[137] to firm rejection[138].

As things stand, a quick round-up of all arguments pro and contra reveals that no definite conclusion can be reached in this matter. Three arguments plead in favour of Androtion. Firstly there is his fourth-century date. More importantly, the congruence of the manuscripts cannot lightly be dismissed. Closely connected with this second point is the observation that textual corruption of Androtion into A. is far more plausible than confusion in the reverse direction[139]. The emendation of the manuscript text to A. can be supported by two considerations: *primo*, A. can tentatively also be dated to the first half of the fourth century B.C., and *secundo*, it is an established fact that he dealt with the Seven Sages in his Τρίπους (cf. F 1-2 of this edition)[140].

On the other side of the spectrum, arguments have been brought forward *against* both hypotheses which ultimately fail to settle the matter for good. According to the one camp A. could hardly be meant in the *passus* under discussion since it is difficult to imagine a place for Sokrates in a work dealing with the legend of the Prize for Wisdom awarded to the various members of the *collegium* of Seven Wise Men; however, the presence of Sokrates in the *Tripod* can easily be explained if we drop the notion that the work was devoted exclusively to the Seven Sages[141]. As for the other camp, a lot has been made of the observation that, judging from the extant material, Androtion had no interest whatsoever in the Seven Sages or philoso-

---

137 Müller originally edited the F under discussion as one of the Atthidographer's, while approving of Siebelis' correction into A. in a short note (*FHG* I, p. 375, F 39), and subsequently edited the F a second time as F 4 of A. of Ephesos (*FHG* II, p. 347). Likewise, Jacoby edited the F under the heading "Zweifelhaftes und Gefälschtes" as F 69 of Androtion (*FGrHist* 324), commenting (IIIb, p. 170-171) that Siebelis' suggestion is "rather obvious" and adding that Androtion's "interest in the history of philosophy seems to have been inconsiderable." Unfortunately Harding (1994) does not express a view on this point in his recent monograph; on the other hand, the fact that philosophical issues do not come up for consideration in this study is in accordance with Jacoby's analysis.

138 Thus Diels – Kranz II (1952³: 252).

139 This is the view of Jacoby in his commentary on 324 F 45 (IIIb, p. 153 + n. 1: "the alteration of Ἄνδρων to Ἀνδροτίων is slight") and F 69 (IIIb, p. 171 + n. 3).

140 The latter point was decisive for Müller (*FHG* I, p. 375 F 39) in his endorsement of Siebelis' conjecture.

141 On which, cf. *supra*, introduction, p. 132-133.

phy[142]. However, true as this may be[143], it hardly counts as a conclusive element against the reading of the manuscripts: it would be methodologically unsound to exclude, on the basis of a mere 68 genuine F remaining from a work originally comprising eight books, the possibility that in some lost part of his *Atthis* Androtion did mention the Seven 'Sophists' after all, no matter in how unlikely a context.

As already indicated above, the case cannot be decided conclusively either way. Especially in view of the manuscripts' unanimity and the unlikely nature of a textual alteration of A. to Androtion, it would nevertheless seem preferable to accept the reading of the manuscripts and to attribute the F under discussion to Androtion of Athens, the Atthidographer.

Jan Bollansée

---

[142] See the references cited above, p. 161 n. 137, to which may be added Jacoby in his introduction to *FGrHist* 324 (III b,1 p. 101 + n. 111).

[143] There is, for example, one F dealing with Solon (*FGrHist* 324 F 34) in the context of Athenian constitutional history, where Solon is considered as a lawgiver, not as one of the Seven Sages.

Text editions and translations

*A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* IV (Lexicographi Graeci 1), Leipzig 1935 (= Stuttgart 1971).

B. Bommelaer, Diodore de Sicile, *Bibliothèque historique, Livre III.* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1989.

M.G. Angeli Bertinelli – C. Carena – M. Manfredini – L. Piccirilli, Plutarco, *Le vite di Nicia e di Crasso* (Scrittori greci e latini), Milano 1993.

J.B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, London - New York 1892.

H. Diels – W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vol., Dublin - Zürich, I. 1951[3] (= 1974); II. 1952[3] (= 1972); III. 1952[3] (= 1975).

J. Dillon – J. Hershbell, Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life. Text, Translation, and Notes* (Texts and Translations 29. Graeco-Roman Religion Series 11), Atlanta 1991.

*A.B. Drachmann, *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vol. III. *Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas. Epimetrum. Indices* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1927 (= Stuttgart - Leipzig 1997).

J. Ferguson, Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromateis I-III* (The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 85), Washington (D.C.) 1991.

M. Gigante, *Frammenti di Ippoboto. Contributo alla storia della storiografia filosofica*, in A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves* (Università di Venezia. Facoltà di lettere e filosofia 7), Padova 1983, p. 151-193.

O. Gigon, *Aristotelis Opera*, III. *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, Berlin - New York 1987.

*A. Hilgard, *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* (Grammatici Graeci I,3), Leipzig 1901 (= Hildesheim 1965).

*R. Kassel – C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci (PCG)*, III 2. *Aristophanes. Testimonia et Fragmenta*, Berlin - New York 1984.

Ph.-E. Legrand, Hérodote, *Histoires. Livre V Terpsichore* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1961[2].

*F.W. Lenz – C.A. Behr, P. Aelius Aristides, *Opera quae exstant omnia. Volumen primum orationes I-XVI complectens. Orationes I et V-XVI edidit F.W. Lenz, praefationem conscripsit et orationes II, III, IV edidit C.A. Behr. Fasciculus tertius orationes III (continuatur), IV-VIII continens*, Leiden 1978.

A. Leurini, Ion Chius, *Testimonia et fragmenta* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23), Amsterdam 1992.

*E.L. Leutsch – F.G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, 2 vol., Göttingen 1839 -1851 (= Hildesheim 1965).

*H.S. Long, Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, 2 vol. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964.

C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, II, Paris 1848.

G.A. Privitera, Pindaro, *Le Istmiche* (Scrittori greci e latini), Milano 1982.

V. Rose, Aristoteles, *Qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1886 (= Stuttgart 1967).

*G. Schroeder – E. des Places, Eusebius Caesariensis, *Praeparatio evangelica, Libri VIII-IX-X.* (Sources chrétiennes 369), Paris 1991.

A.-Ph. Segonds, *Les fragments de l'*Histoire de la philosophie, in E. des Places, Porphyre, *Vie de Pythagore-Lettre à Marcella. Texte établi et traduit par E. Des Places avec un appendice d'A.-Ph. Segonds* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1982, p. 163-197.
A. Smith, Porphyrius, *Fragmenta. Fragmenta arabica David Wasserstein interpretante* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Stuttgart - Leipzig 1993.
*O. Stählin – L. Früchtel – U. Treu, Clemens Alexandrinus, 2. *Stromata Buch I-VI* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 15), Berlin 1985[4].
M. Untersteiner, *Sofisti. Testimonianze e frammenti*, fasc. 1. *Protagora e Seniade. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Firenze 1961[2] (= 1967).
H. Usener, *Epicurea*, Leipzig 1887 (= Stuttgart 1966).
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Text und Kommentar* IV. *Demetrios von Phaleron*, Basel - Stuttgart 1968[2].
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar* I. *Dikaiarchos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1967[2].
M.R. Wright, *Empedocles. The Extant Fragments. Edited, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Concordance*, New Haven - London 1981 (= London 1995).

Secondary literature

S. Accame, *Erodoto e l'introduzione dell' alfabeto in Grecia*, in L. Gasperini (ed.), *Scritti sul mondo antico in memoria di F. Grosso*, Roma 1981, p. 3-11.
M.G. Amadasi Guzzo, *"The Shadow Line." Réflexions sur l'introduction de l'alphabet en Grèce*, in C. Baurain – C. Bonnet – V. Krings (ed.), *Phoinikeia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989*, Namur 1991, p. 293-311.
O. Barkowski, art. *Sieben Weise*, in *RE* 2A, 2 (1923), col. 2242-2264.
H. Berger, art. *Andron* (14), in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 2160.
R. Beutler, art. *Porphyrios* (21), in *RE* 22, 1 (1953), col. 275-313.
F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, III.2. *Demosthenes' Genossen und Gegner*, Leipzig 1898[2].
R. Blum, *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography. Translated from the German by H.H. Wellisch*, Madison (Wi.) 1991.
J. Bollansée, *Hermippos of Smyrna and his Biographical Writings. A Reappraisal*, Leuven 1998.
W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism. Translated by E.L. Minar, Jr.*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1972.
A. Chitwood, *The Death of Empedocles*, in *AJPh* 107 (1986), p. 175-191.
C.J. Classen, *Einleitung*, in Id. (ed.), *Sophistik*, Darmstadt 1976, p. 1-18.
P. Corssen, *Der Abaris des Heraklides Ponticus. Ein Beitrag zu der Geschichte der Pythagoraslegende*, in *RhM* 67 (1912), p. 20-47.
P. Corssen, *Varia*, in *BPhW* 31 (1911), col. 1389-1390.
K. Deichgräber, *Die griechische Empirikerschule. Sammlung der Fragmente und Darstellung der Lehre*, Berlin - Zürich 1965[2].
R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684-321 B.C.*, Cambridge - New York - New Rochelle - Melbourne - Sydney 1989.

P. DUCREY, *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris 1968.
R.B. EDWARDS, *Kadmos the Phoenician. A Study in Greek Legends and the Mycenaean Age*, Amsterdam 1979.
L.R. FARNELL, *The Works of Pindar*, II. *Critical Commentary*, London 1932.
D. FEHLING, *Die Sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Studie*, Bern - Frankfurt am Main - New York 1985.
E. FLORES, *Synesis. Studi su forme del pensiero storico e politico greco e romano*, Napoli 1991.
R.L. FOWLER, *Herodotos and his Contemporaries*, in *JHS* 116 (1996), p. 62-87.
P. HARDING, *Androtion and the* Atthis. *The Fragments Translated with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1994.
R. HERZOG, *Die Umschrift der älteren griechischen Literatur in das ionische Alphabet* (Rektoratsprogramm Basel), Leipzig 1912 (*n.v.*).
A. HEUBECK – A. HOEKSTRA, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. II. *Books IX-XVI*, Oxford 1989.
W.W. HOW – J. WELLS, *A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes*, II, Oxford 1928^2 (= 1964).
B.S.J. ISSERLIN, *The Transfer of the Alphabet to the Greeks. The State of Documentation*, in C. BAURAIN – C. BONNET – V. KRINGS (ed.), *Phoinikeia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989*, Namur 1991, p. 283-291.
F. JACOBY, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente*, Berlin 1902 (= New York 1973).
F. JACOBY, art. *Skamon*, in *RE* 3A,1 (1927), col. 437.
F. JACOBY, *The First Athenian Prose Writer*, in *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 3,13 (1947), p. 13-64 [= H. BLOCH (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag am 19. März 1956*, Leiden 1956, p. 100-143].
W. JUDEICH, art. *Archinos* (1), in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 541.
G.B. KERFERD, *The Sophistic Movement*, Cambridge - London - New York - New Rochelle - Melbourne - Sydney 1981.
J.F. KINDSTRAND, *Anacharsis. The Legend and the Apophthegmata*, Uppsala 1981.
J. KIRCHNER (ed.), *Prosopographia Attica*, I, Berlin 1901 (= 1966).
A. KLEINGÜNTHER, *Πρῶτος Εὑρετής. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*, Leipzig 1933.
K. KUIPER, *Le récit de la coupe de Bathyclès dans les* Iambes *de Callimaque*, in *REG* 29 (1916), p. 404-429.
D. LATEINER, *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Toronto - Buffalo - London 1989.
I. LÉVY, *Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore*, Paris 1926.
H. MARTIN, Jr., *Alcaeus*, New York 1972.
M. MEIER, art. *Archinos*, in *DNP* 1 (1996), col. 1002.
K. MEISTER, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*, Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln 1990.
A.A. MOSSHAMMER, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*, Lewisburg - London 1979.
A. MOSSHAMMER, *The Epoch of the Seven Sages*, in *CSCA* 9 (1976), p. 165-180.
A. PANAGOPOULOS, *Captives and Hostages in the Peloponnesian War*, Athena 1978 (= Amsterdam 1989).

P. Pédech, *Trois historiens méconnus. Théopompe, Duris, Phylarque*, Paris 1989.
J.A. Philip, *Aristotle's Monograph on the Pythagoreans*, in *TAPhA* 94 (1963), p. 185-198.
E. Reisch, art. *Dreifuss*, in *RE* 5,2 (1905), col. 1669-1696.
N. Robertson, *The Myth of the First Sacred War*, in *CQ*, N.S. 28 (1978), p. 38-73.
W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe. Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, München 1980.
G. Schepens, *L'apogée de l'* archè *spartiate comme époque historique dans l'historiographie grecque du début du IVe S. av. J.-C.*, in *AncSoc* 24 (1993), p. 169-203.
G. Schepens, *L' 'autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du Ve siècle avant J.-C.*, Bruxelles 1980.
G. Schepens, *Historiographical Problems in Ephorus*, in AA. VV., *Historiographia antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae*, Leuven 1977, p. 95-118.
G. Schepens, *The Phoenicians in Ephorus' Universal History*, in E. Lipinski (ed.), *Studia Phoenicia*, V. *Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985*, Leuven 1987, p. 315-330.
G. Schepens – K. Delcroix, *Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception*, in O. Pecere – A. Stramaglia (ed.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, Casino 1996, p. 375-460.
H.S. Schibli, *Pherekydes of Syros*, Oxford 1990.
W. Schmid – O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I. Teil. *Die klassische Periode der griechischen Literatur*, 1. Band. *Die griechische Literatur vor der attischen Hegemonie*, München 1929.
E. Schwartz, art. *Andron* (11), in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 2159-2160 (= 1894a).
E. Schwartz, art. *Andron* (12), in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 2160 (= 1894b).
G. Shipley, *A History of Samos 800-188* BC, Oxford 1987.
G.S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, Montreal - Kingston - London - Buffalo 1991.
G. Shrimpton – K.M. Gillis, *Appendix 1. Herodotus' Source Citations*, in G.S. Shrimpton, *History and Memory in Ancient Greece*, Montreal - Kingston - London - Buffalo 1997, p. 229-265.
B. Snell, *Zur Geschichte vom Gastmahl der Sieben Weisen*, in O. Hiltbrunner – H. Kornhardt – F. Tietze (ed.), *Thesaurismata. Festschrift für Ida Kapp zum 70. Geburtstag*, München 1954, p. 105-111 (= B. Snell, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Göttingen 1966, p. 115-118) (cited after the 1966 edition).
P.A. Stadter, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*, Chapel Hill - London 1989.
F. Stähelin, art. *Kallistratos* (2), in *RE* 10,2 (1919), col. 1735.
E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, Leipzig - Berlin 1912.
F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 vol., Leipzig 1891-1892 (= Hildesheim 1965).
J. Töpffer, art. *Aktaios* (1), in *RE* 1,1 (1893), col. 1212.
D.L.S. Toye, *Pherecydes*, diss. Univ. of Calif. Santa Barbara 1991 [*n.v.*, see the summary in *APh* 63 (1994 on 1992) no. 3879].
J.S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, vol. 3. *ΑΡ- to ΑΥΛΟΝ*, Toronto 1995.
H. Usener, *Lectiones Graecae*, in *RhM* 25 (1870), p. 574-616.

B.L. van der Waerden, *Die Pythagoreer. Religiöse Bruderschaft und Schule der Wissenschaft*, Zürich - München 1979.
B. Virgilio, *Commento storico al quinto libro delle "Storie" di Erodoto. Introduzione, commento storico, note complementari, testo, traduzione e indici*, Pisa 1975.
K. von Fritz, art. *Nausiphanes*, in *RE* 16,2 (1935), col. 2021-2027.
K. von Fritz, art. *Pythagoras,* 1B. *Pythagoreer. Pythagorismus*, in *RE* 24 (1963), col. 209-268.
E. Wellmann, art. *Andron* (15), in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 2160-2161.
F. Wehrli, *Gnome, Anekdote und Biographie*, in *MH* 30 (1973), p. 193-208.
G. Wentzel, art. *Aktaion* (1), in *RE* 1,1 (1893), col. 1209.
S. West, *Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus*, in *JHS* 111 (1991), p. 144-160.
W. Wiersma, *The Seven Sages and the Prize of Wisdom*, in *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 3, 1 (1934), p. 150-154.
H. Wulf, *De fabellis cum collegii septem sapientium memoria coniunctis quaestiones criticae*, in AA. VV., *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses* XIII, Halle 1897, p. 161-216.
K. Ziegler, art. *Plagiat*, in *RE* 20,2 (1950), col. 1956-1997.

1006. Eudoxos of Knidos
(° c. 390 B.C.–† c. 337 B.C.)

F

1 (Gisinger p. 63 = F 371 Lasserre) Diog. Laert. 1,29-30: (29) Εὔδοξος δ' ὁ Κνίδιος καὶ Εὐάνθης ὁ Μιλήσιός (*FGrHist* IV A2 1018) φασι τῶν Κροίσου τινὰ φίλων λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ποτήριον χρυσοῦν, ὅπως δῷ τῷ σοφωτάτῳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων· τὸν δὲ δοῦναι Θαλῇ. (30) Καὶ περιελθεῖν εἰς Χίλωνα, ὃν πυνθάνεσθαι τοῦ Πυθίου τίς αὑτοῦ σοφώτερος. Καὶ τὸν ἀνειπεῖν Μύσωνα, – περὶ οὗ λέξομεν (*sc.* Diog. Laert. 1,106)· τοῦτον οἱ περὶ Εὔδοξον ἀντὶ Κλεοβούλου τιθέασι, Πλάτων (*Prot.* 343a) δ' ἀντὶ Περιάνδρου.

---

5 ἀνειπεῖν : ἀνελεῖν *Richards*

1006. Eudoxos of Knidos
(° c. 390 B.C.–† c. 337 B.C.)

F

1 Eudoxos of Knidos and Euanthes of Miletos state that one of Kroisos' friends received a golden drinking-cup from the king who instructed him to give it to the wisest of the Greeks, and that he handed it to Thales. Then, so our sources continue, the cup went round and came to Chilon, who inquired from Apollo if anyone were wiser than he; the god replied 'Myson'—about whom we will speak below; Eudoxos and the writers following him place this man (*sc.* in the *collegium*) instead of Kleobulos, Platon substitutes him for Periandros.

1006. Eudoxos of Knidos
(° c. 390 B.C.–† c. 337 B.C.)

Introduction

Modern scholarship is almost unanimous in accepting that the famous fourth-century mathematician, astronomer, geographer and all-round philosopher Eudoxos of Knidos[1] is meant in this passage, culled from Diogenes Laertios' discussion of the various traditions regarding the prize for wisdom awarded to the Seven Sages (1,27-33). While the particulars are still a matter of debate, it is also agreed that E. did not devote a separate monograph to the subject, but touched upon it in his Γῆς περίοδος; more specifically it is assumed that the present F derives from a digression elicited by the discussion of a place connected with the Sages[2]. The proverbial exception to the rule is provided by Fehling, whose hypercritical views on early (i.e. pre-Platonic and ante-Callimachean) traditions regarding the *collegium* of seven wise men and the *Agon* held among them are matched only by his equally excessive scepticism regarding Herodotos' acknowledgement of his sources[3]. A full discussion of Fehling's theory, which rests in part on the outdated view that Diogenes systematically invented references to his earliest (fifth- and fourth-century) 'sources', can be found in the preliminary remarks to the present section on fourth-century writers dealing with the Seven Sages[4]. Suffice it here to say,

---

[1] On this important figure see, most recently, TRAMPEDACH (1994: 57-61), who will lead the interested reader to the older literature; special mention may nevertheless be made of LASSERRE (1966), who collected the ancient *testimonia* regarding and the fragments of E. A new edition of the geographical F will be included in the forthcoming edition of *FGrHist* V, which is currently being prepared by a working group of the Ernst-Kirsten-Gesellschaft [see the 'Arbeitsvorhaben' in *Gnomon* 66 (1994), p. 192]. In addition to Gisinger and Lasserre, whose views will be discussed below, KUIPER (1916: 419-420), BARKOWSKI (1923: 2245, 2251), HICKS II (1931²: 701) and JACOBY in the commentary on 491-492 F 16-18 (IIIb, p. 408 n. 45 & 49)—to name but these four—also assumed that the famous E. is meant here.

[2] While GISINGER (1921: 63) attributed the F to the third book of the work (the *Lydiaka*), starting from the legends connecting King Kroisos with the Seven Sages, LASSERRE (1966: 266-267) was more cautious, listing the F among the quotations "aus unbestimmten Büchern"; he hesitated between the descriptions of either Miletos (Thales' home town) or Chen (where Myson's cradle supposedly stood), at the same time ruling out the possibility that the *excursus* was in any way linked to Delphi (about which, cf. *infra*, p. 176 + n. 21).

[3] See FEHLING (1985: 29-37). For this scholar's opinion on Herodotos' source citations, and harsh critique thereof, see the references given above, in the *Preliminary observations*, p. 114 n. 7, and on p.130.

[4] Cf. *supra*, p. 112-119.

firstly, that there is no reason to doubt the Laertian's veracity in the light of the conclusions reached by Mejer[5] in regard to his Hellenistic background; secondly, that E. could, indeed, have elaborated upon the Seven Sages in an *excursus* in his *Description of the World*—a convincing parallel for which is furnished by the case of Leandr(i)os of Miletos (late fourth or early third century B.C.), whose local history of his home town (Μιλησιακά) apparently contained a full treatment of the Seven Sages[6].

The latter assumption would seem to render the inclusion of this E.-F in the present fascicle highly problematic, but two grounds can be adduced to justify its treatment here. First and foremost the *passus* deals with a theme which would continue to feature prominently in later (fourth-century and Hellenistic) literature, not least in biographical treatises (cf. Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν by Hermippos of Smyrna—*FGrHist* IV A3, 1026 F 9-20) and in works Περὶ βίων (see Dikaiarchos F 30-32 WEHRLI I and possibly Klearchos of Soloi F 70 WEHRLI III). An additional point is that, together with the remaining F of Andron of Ephesos' Τρίπους (1005 F 2a), this is one of the oldest literary testimonies for the *Agon*-tradition still extant.

---

5 See MEJER (1978).

6 See *FGrHist* 491-492 F 16-18 ("Reste einer ausführlichen behandlung der Sieben Weisen"); we know that Leandr(i)os' discussion of the Seven Sages (and his Μιλησιακά in general) served as a source to both KALLIMACHOS (F 191,32-77 PFEIFFER I) and his pupil HERMIPPOS (*FGrHist* 1026 F 10 and 12 with commentary). Similarly Phanodikos of Delos might have discussed the legend of the ἀγὼν σοφίας in his Δηλιακά: cf. *FGrHist* 397 F 4 with Jacoby's remarks in the introduction to Phanodikos and in the commentary on the F (*FGrHist* IIIb, p. 208-209 and 209-210).
For a very long time, modern scholarship tended to identify an author by the rare name of Leandr(i)os, who is quoted several times in ancient literature (*FGrHist* 492 F 10-19), with the fourth-century-B.C. writer Maiandrios of Miletos, whose name and local history of his home town are attested by epigraphical evidence (cf. *FGrHist* 491 F 1). WENDEL (1935: 356-360) tried to set the record straight and argued that the said Leandrios had an identity of his own, and attempted furthermore to identify him as a contemporary of Kallimachos on the basis of a textual emendation. While other scholars had no difficulty in endorsing Wendel's arguments—see, among others, VON DER MÜHLL (1942: 95) and PFEIFFER I (1965²: 96 *ad* F 88)—, nonetheless JACOBY in his commentary on *FGrHist* 491-492 (IIIb, p. 404-405) was not at all charmed by Wendel's effort and expressed a very harsh (but fair) judgement on the proposed synchronisation with Kallimachos. However he, too, had to admit that it is rather problematic simply to equate the two names, a fact which he acknowledged by granting a separate number to both authors while printing their respective F with continuous numeration; if they really were two different persons, he finally agreed to place them in one and the same generation c. 330-300.

Commentary

(1) The delimitation of the F poses no problem: the text to be ascribed to E. (and Euanthes) coincides with the information contained in the indirect speech (right up to Μύσωνα), augmented with the additional detail given in the subsequent parenthesis. The continuation in direct speech immediately following the printed text[7] obviously belongs to a different author, who can, in all probability, be identified as Diogenes Laertios himself: he clearly anticipates (in a rather clumsy way) the discussion of the same topic further on in the first book at § 106, where a cross-reference is made to the *passus* under discussion.

Two important aspects of the general tradition regarding the Seven Sages come up for discussion here: first and foremost the F focuses on the prize for wisdom connected with an *Agon* established to designate the wisest of all mankind, and secondly there is a note on the composition of the *collegium*.

In its most common form the story regarding the *Agon* of the Seven Sages involves a bronze or gold tripod which is found under miraculous circumstances, somehow appears to be reserved for τῷ σοφωτάτῳ, then gets passed around among the Seven Sages and finally ends up at a sanctuary of Apollo[8]. Even from this basic structure (which, judging from the existing evidence, could be fleshed out *ad libitum*) E.'s story differs in a remarkable way: the tripod is replaced by a gold wine-cup, the object is not discovered under extraordinary circumstances, but is sent out with a specific dedication by King Kroisos of Lydia, and one Myson is the final recipient through the mediation of Apollo. While singularly different from the best-known version of the legend, this account is not wholly unique: parallels (again, with notable variations as to the individual details) can be found in the fragmentary remains of the Hellenistic poets Phoinix of Kolophon and

[7] Cf. Diog. Laert. 1,30: Περὶ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Μύσωνος) δὴ τάδε ἀνεῖλεν ὁ Πύθιος·
Οἰταῖόν τινα φημὶ Μύσων' ἐνὶ Χηνὶ γενέσθαι
σοῦ μᾶλλον πραπίδεσσιν ἀρηρότα πευκαλίμῃσιν.
Ὁ δ' ἐρωτήσας ἦν Ἀνάχαρσις.

[8] For a survey (with all relevant references to the ancient authorities) and discussion of the various traditions such as they are preserved in extant ancient literature, see Wulf (1897: 173-216); Kuiper (1916: 414-420); Barkowski (1923: 2248-2251); Wiersma (1934: 150-154); Fehling (1985: 25-39). Let it once again be noted that the latter's conclusions should be approached with due caution (see the *Preliminary observations* made above, p. 112-119).

Kallimachos, as well as of the prose writers Leandrios of Miletos (who was cited by Kallimachos as his source) and Klearchos of Soloi[9].

Actually modern scholarship is inclined to posit the chronological primacy of this particular branch of the tradition, featuring a ποτήριον instead of a τρίπους and a human rather than a divine dedicator of the prize of wisdom[10]. In keeping with this assumption (though by no means conclusive proof of the early nature of the story) is the prominent role played by Kroisos in the proceedings as described by E.: from Herodotos onward the Lydian king was portrayed in close connection with Greek sages, in some cases even hosting the *symposium* which they all attended[11]. Regardless of which version of the legend preceded which, it is commonly accepted that E., the earliest representative of the ποτήριον-branch, did not originate it. Still some scholars have argued that the Cnidian's account was a cocktail mix which he himself prepared on the basis of ingredients borrowed from earlier authors. To be sure, this suggestion cannot lightly be dismissed as such. Having said that, however, the conjectures concerning E.'s antecedents which Wulf and Gisinger formulated are easily refuted[12]. On the whole, moreover, Lasserre made the better thought-out sug-

---

[9] For a general testimony on this branch of the tradition, cf. PLUT. *Sol.* 4,8; for PHOINIX, cf. ATHEN. 11,495d (= F 4 p. 234 POWELL); for KALLIMACHOS, cf. F 191,32-77 PFEIFFER I; for LEANDR(I)OS, cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,28-29 (= *FGrHist* 491-492 F 18); for KLEARCHOS, cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,30 (= F 70 WEHRLI III). The Kallimachos-F has attracted most of the attention of modern scholarship; see, among others, KUIPER (1916: 419-429); DAWSON (1950: 23-24); FEHLING (1985: 22-24).

[10] So WIERSMA (1934: 152), followed by FEHLING (1985: 22 + n. 26, 25-27).

[11] Cf., for instance, HERODOT. 1,27; 29-33; EPHOROS *ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 1,40 (= *FGrHist* 70 F 181; cf. also DIOD. 9,2; 25-28; DIOG. LAERT. 1,67; 81; 99; 105); PLUT. *Sol.* 27-28.

[12] Indeed, the proposals of GISINGER (1921: 64), based on suggestions made earlier by WULF (1897: 185-186 n. 1; 200), do not stand up to close scrutiny. Firstly, it is not possible to combine the story as told by E. with the version of Leandr(i)os of Miletos, because the latter differs on a number of characteristic points. The idea that the unnamed friend of Kroisos in the present F can be identified as the Arcadian Bathykles who is featured as the dedicator of a gold cup in Leandr(i)os' F 18 (cf. KALLIMACHOS F 191,32-77 PFEIFFER I)—an idea which was entertained not only by the aforementioned scholars, but also by KUIPER (1916: 428-429)—constitutes a very tenuous link which is not supported by the ancient evidence: the exact roles played in the proceedings by Bathykles and the anonymous φίλος Κροίσου are entirely different. Furthermore, the composition of the *collegium* of sages in Leandr(i)os' account must have been different from that in E.'s, as the former is said to have excluded both Kleobulos *and* Myson (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,41 = *FGrHist* 492 F 16). These discrepancies far outweigh the fact that Thales was the first recipient of the prize in both E.'s and Leandr(i)os' reports, for that was nothing but a commonplace in the tradition concerning the *Agon* in general.

Secondly, E.'s version was erroneously linked to F of Andron of Ephesos and

gestion that the rendition found in the present F is based on a literary motif which also occurs in early Socratic literature (the most famous instance of which being the episode with Chairephon inquiring at the Delphic oracle about any man wiser than Sokrates) and may well go back to the sophistic era[13].

In regard to the second point, concerning the group of Sages as described by E., we find that he undoubtedly thought of a clearly defined closed group of wise men, amongst whom the award was passed around (περιελθεῖν). At the same time, Myson does appear as something of an outsider in this context: in no other version of the *Agon*-tradition does any deity serve as a 'master of ceremonies' who directs the proceedings, for the sages always indicate the next receiver themselves. In this respect Lasserre was rightly reminded of the suggestion made by Gigon (in an altogether different context) to the effect that in one form of the tradition regarding the *collegium* there were six generally recognized and famous sages who were complemented by a seventh, who was acknowledged as the wisest of them all precisely because nobody was able to report anything worthwhile about him[14]. As a matter of fact, the evolution of the Myson-legend, to the extent that it can tentatively be reconstructed, goes some way toward corroborating what was no more than an assumption on the part of Gigon. The designation of Myson as a Sage by Apollo can already be traced back to Hipponax (end of the 6th century B.C.), but it has been conjectured that the relevant verse—DIOG. LAERT. 1, 107

Hipponax of Ephesos. The order in which E. placed the sages who were awarded the prize for wisdom—Thales, Chilon and Myson—was doubtless inspired partly by Andron "who also put Chilon in second place" (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,30 = *FGrHist* 1005 F 2a) and partly by Hipponax, the oldest known source for the oracle in which Apollo declared Myson to be the wisest of all mankind (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,107 = F 65 DEGANI). Andron's account, however, was radically different from E.'s in at least three respects: the context of the *Agon* (a competition instituted by the citizens of Argos, with no mention whatever of Kroisos), the nature of the prize (a tripod instead of a drinking-cup) and the number of sages who were awarded the prize (only two—the Spartans Aristodemos and Chilon—, while E. must have had in mind a full *collegium* of seven wise men, as will be argued below). As for Hipponax: this point will also be touched on in greater detail below (p. 174-175), but it can already be noted that Myson's incorporation into the *collegium* must have occurred in the time after the Ephesian iambographer and prior to the Cnidian polymath, and hence there are no grounds for making the latter rely on the former for that point.

[13] See LASSERRE (1966: 267), with reference to GIGON (1979²: 96-99) for the Chairephon-oracle.

[14] See LASSERRE (1966: 267), referring to GIGON (1979²: 198).
A strikingly similar case to Myson's is that of Aristodemos, another noble unknown, who featured in the constitution of the Seven Sages as presented by ANDRON OF EPHESOS in his Τρίπους (cf. *FGrHist* 1005 F 2).

= F 65 Degani: Καὶ Μύσων, ὃν Ὠπόλλων / ἀνεῖπεν ἀνδρῶν σωφρονέστατον πάντων—has nothing to do with a story about the Seven Sages, and is derived instead from a different context intended to celebrate the simple and happy life of the unassuming and practical peasant as that of the paragon of wisdom[15]. Still, it remains an indisputable fact that at least in the fourth century B.C. Myson was effectively regarded as a member of the venerable *collegium*: the occurrence of his name in the list given in Plato's *Protagoras* (343a) bears witness to that. Now, it is not hard to see how the original story about the simple, unassuming peasant Myson (so beautifully portrayed in the story told by Diogenes Laertios at 1, 106) would have provided the point of departure for his subsequent incorporation into the group in the form in which we encounter it here[16].

In the course of time a standard version of the *collegium* of the Seven Sages was eventually agreed upon, but especially in the fifth to the third centuries B.C. the group's composition was subject to much variation, depending on the considerations (patriotic, philosophical or otherwise) that prevailed in any given quarter with an interest in the tradition: in Diogenes Laertios' Book 1 alone (which contains the most comprehensive extant treatment of the issue) no less than twenty-three names are cited of wise men who at one time or another were included in the group[17]. As far as E. is concerned, we can only be certain that he included Thales, Chilon and Myson and excluded the tyrant Kleobulos of Lindos[18]. However, taking into consideration

---

[15] For this moralizing context of the Hipponax-F, see Herzog (1922: 149-170), whose conclusions gained wide acceptance: they were endorsed, for instance, by Wehrli (1931: 42); Pfister (1933: 1192-1193); Parke – Wormell I (1956: 384-385).

[16] For a detailed treatment of Myson as a member of the Seven Sages, see the commentary on F 19 of Hermippos of Smyrna (*FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026).

[17] Twenty-one names are given in Diog. Laert. 1,41-42: (in alphabetical order) Akusilaos of Argos, Anacharsis the Scythian, Anaxagoras of Klazomenai, Aristodemos of Sparta, Bias of Priene, Chilon of Sparta, Epicharmos of Sicily, Epimenides of Crete, Kleobulos of Lindos, Lasos of Hermione, Leophantos of Lebedos or Ephesos, Linos of Thebes, Myson of Chen(ai), Orpheus, Pamphylos, Periandros of Korinthos, Pherekydes of Syros, Pittakos of Mytilena, Pythagoras of Samos, Solon of Athens and Thales of Miletos. To these can be added Peisistratos of Athens (cf. Diog. Laert. 1,13; 108; 122) and the doublet Periandros of Ambrakia (cf. Diog. Laert. 1,98-99). For a full discussion of this point, see, once again, the commentary on Hermippos' Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν, in *FGrHist* IV A 3 (especially the commentary on F 10).

[18] Though the F under discussion should not be construed to mean that E. deliberately left out Kleobulos in favour of Myson because he was a tyrant (and the same goes for Plato's alleged 'removal' of Periandros from the *collegium*): the author may simply have followed a pre-existing tradition, from which the Lindian tyrant happened to be absent, and he (as well as Plato) may have been credited with fashionable anti-tyrannical feelings by later generations. For this, see Barkowski (1923: 2243); Kindstrand (1981: 33-34 + n. 4; 38; 40-42).

that Solon, Pittakos and Bias belonged to the fixed core of sages, who managed to find their way into all groups[19], their names can safely be added to the previous three. That leaves only one place vacant, the most likely candidate for which would seem to be Periandros[20].

Trivial these musings are not, for modern scholars have actually tried, on the basis of E.'s version of the *Agon*-legend and of the particular configuration of the *collegium* featured in his work, to draw conclusions about his position vis-à-vis the tradition of the Seven Sages and, on a higher level, about his general position as a philosopher. The main inferences thus drawn are that E. did not display overzealous patriotic bias (by omitting Kleobulos from the list, although Rhodian Lindos together with Knidos belonged to the ἑξάπολις χώρη off and on the south-western shores of Asia Minor) and that he was not a blind follower of Plato's beliefs and opinions (as can be gathered from the fact that he did not share the latter's appraisal of Delphi and Delphic wisdom, and from the different composition of his group of wise men)[21]. The second point is actually consistent with the view, recently propounded by Centrone, that the assertion that E. was a disciple of Plato is only a later invention, and that the Cnidian rather leaned towards the Pythagoreans and the Italian school of philosophy[22].

The central issue within the context of the present fascicle must be the transmission of the F under discussion. Of course the fact that the Euanthes of Miletos referred to is utterly obscure—his name is otherwise unattested in the whole of classical literature[23]—renders the dis-

---

[19] This conclusion was already reached by DIKAIARCHOS (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,41 = F 32 WEHRLI I) and the statement is confirmed by the remaining evidence: cf. LESKY (1971³: 187-188).

[20] BARKOWSKI (1923: 2245) obviously reached the same conclusion.

[21] See GISINGER (1921: 64-65); LASSERRE (1966: 267). The very fact that Delphi is absent from E.'s version of the *Agon*-tradition (no tripod, and the oracle consulted by Chilon could just as well be that of Didymaean Apollo) induced Lasserre to rule out the possibility that the Cnidian added the *excursus* on the Seven Sages to his description of Delphi (cf. *supra*, p. 170 n. 2).

[22] See CENTRONE (1992: 4215-4216). On the dubious nature of the ancient tradition stressing E.'s close relationship and debt to Plato, see also TRAMPEDACH (1994: 58-60).

[23] To be sure, there *is* an equally little-known EUANTHES OF SAMOS, who reportedly wrote about Solon (cf. PLUT. *Sol.* 11,1-2, cited through the intermediary of HERMIPPOS OF SMYRNA = *FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 15). Now, because of the similarity both of the first names and the information they are cited for (in relation to the Seven Sages), some scholars have argued that one and the same person must be meant, the different ethnics arising from an error by Plutarch or corruption in the manuscript trans-

cussion of the matter problematic: he could have been E.'s source, one of the authors who followed the Cnidian's version (οἱ περὶ Εὔδοξον)[24], or a wholly independent author who had come across the same tradition as E. via a different path. Still, irrespective of these various possibilities *and* in spite of Mejer's rehabilitation of Diogenes Laertios as a writer with an independent personality, the Laertian is unlikely to have found the information about Euanthes directly in the latter's work, and hence it is justifiable to postulate an intermediary source at least for the Milesian writer. This leaves two options open: either Diogenes found the quotation from Euanthes in the unknown 'Mittelquelle' and combined it with a reference of his own invention to E.[25], or he already found E. and Euanthes quoted together there. Unfortunately that is as far as the evidence allows us to proceed on firm ground: beyond this point we are left to guesswork.

All the same one interesting and attractive proposition has been made regarding this point: the name of Hermippos of Smyrna has been put forward as Diogenes' source for the entire *passus* under discussion. Admittedly this suggestion was first made at a time when nineteenth-century 'Quellenforschung' was in its heyday and Diogenes was dismissed as a mindless excerptor who compiled his work from one or (at most) a few main sources[26]. Nevertheless, good grounds can be adduced for upholding it. First of all Hermippos was indisputably an important source of information for the Laertian's *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* (not least in Book 1 on the Greek sages, where he is cited by name six times), and we can reasonably assume that the amount of information drawn from the 'Callimachean' exceeds the thirty-seven *nominatim* quotations found in that

---

mission; accordingly they have gone on to claim that Euanthes of Miletos was the common source underlying both passages. For this identification of the two homonyms, see MÜLLER *FHG* III p. 2 *not.*; p. 39 F 11; in addition, see JACOBY (1907: 846); WEHRLI Suppl. I (1974: 48). The gratuitous nature of these considerations, however, is abundantly clear: since we have no other reference *either* to a Euanthes of Miletos *or* a Euanthes of Samos, it might just as well be argued that Diogenes made a mistake and that the former should be identified as the Euanthes of Samos mentioned by Hermippos. Therefore, it would ultimately seem more advisable not to tamper with either of the passages and simply to recognize our ignorance: we could well be dealing here with two obscure writers who happened to share a first name and an interest in the Seven Sages, but who were two distinct persons after all [as was already suggested by LEO (1901: 126)].

[24] GISINGER (1921: 63-64) took this for granted, although rather gratuitously.

[25] There are three other quotations from E.'s Γῆς περίοδος in DIOGENES (cf. 1,8; 8,90; 9,83 = F 341; 339; 278 LASSERRE), and it is certainly not impossible that he had read (part of) the famous work [on 8,90, see MEJER (1978: 34 + n. 71)].

[26] See BOHREN (1867: 14), followed by GISINGER (1921: 63).

work[27]. Secondly, both Euanthes and E. could well have been cited by Hermippos in his Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν: on the one hand, the case of Euanthes is reminiscent of the acknowledgements of otherwise unknown sources abounding in the Callimachean's F[28]; on the other hand, we actually know that Hermippos was aware of the work of E. and included a short biographical note on the Cnidian in his treatise *On the Seven Sages*[29].

Be that as it may, the cumulative aspect of these considerations still does not add up to a clear-cut case for the biographer Hermippos as Diogenes' source for the *passus* under discussion. Indeed, as stated above, definite answers cannot be reached in this matter: similar hypotheses featuring different writers—be it another Hellenistic biographer like Satyros[30], or an unknown antiquarian who wrote compilatory treatises in the vein of Andron of Ephesos' Τρίπους, Demetrios of Phaleron's Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα or Sosiades' Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ὑποθῆκαι[31]—are equally conceivable. At the same time, though, it has hopefully been shown that the present F *could possibly derive* from a biographical work based on the many legends and folktales circulating in antiquity about the various members of the *collegium* of the Seven Sages, and hence that E. can be seen as the earliest remaining representative of a given tradition which, among other things, furnished later biographical literature with its material. In the present state of affairs, this conclusion would seem to warrant the inclusion of the F under discussion, originating from a non-biographical work, in a collection of F conceived to shed light on the origins of biographical writing proper and on important antecedents in the ancient Greek world.

Jan BOLLANSÉE

---

[27] On Diogenes' relation to Hermippos, see MEJER (1978: 32-34); see also chapter II. c in BOLLANSÉE (1998).

[28] No less than seven F (out of a total of some eighty-five) contain references to wholly obscure authors who have otherwise failed to leave any trace whatever in our written sources: on this, see chapter III.3 in BOLLANSÉE (1998).

[29] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 8,88 = *FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 9.

[30] Who also wrote on the Seven Sages: cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,68; 82 (an edition of and commentary on Satyros' F is forthcoming in *FGrHist* IV A 4, under number 1033).

[31] For ANDRON OF EPHESOS, see the commentary on 1005 in this fascicle; for the works of DEMETRIOS and SOSIADES, cf. STOB. *Ecl.* 3,1.172-173 p. 111-128 HENSE I.

Text editions and translations

F. Gisinger, *Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos* (ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Weltbildes und der griechischen Wissenschaft 6), Leipzig 1921 (= Amsterdam 1967).

R.D. Hicks, Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers. With an English Translation* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge (Mass.), I. 1972² (= 1992); II. 1931² (= 1991).

F. Lasserre, *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Texte und Kommentare. Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 4), Berlin 1966.

*H.S. Long, Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, 2 vol. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964.

C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* III, Paris 1849.

R. Pfeiffer, Callimachus, I. *Fragmenta*. II. *Hymni et epigrammata*, Oxford 1965².

F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Suppl. I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel - Stuttgart 1974.

Secondary literature

O. Barkowski, art. *Sieben Weise*, in *RE* 2A, 2 (1923), col. 2242-2264.
F.A. Bohren, *De septem sapientibus*, diss. Bonn 1867.
J. Bollansée, *Hermippos of Smyrna and his Biographical Writings. A Reappraisal*, Leuven 1998.
B. Centrone, *L'VIII libro di Diogene Laerzio*, in W. Haase (ed.), *ANRW* II 36,6, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 4183-4217.
C.M. Dawson, *The Iambi of Callimachus. A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory*, in *YClS* 11 (1950), p. 1-168.
D. Fehling, *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Studie*, Bern - Frankfurt am Main - New York 1985.
O. Gigon, *Sokrates. Sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*, Bern 1979[2].
R. Herzog, *Das delphische Orakel als ethischer Preisrichter*, in E. Horneffer, *Der junge Platon, I. Sokrates und die Apologie*, Gießen 1922, p. 149-170.
F. Jacoby, art. *Euanthes* (6-7), in *RE* 6, 1 (1907), col. 846.
J.F. Kindstrand, *Anacharsis. The Legend and the Apophthegmata*, Uppsala 1981.
K. Kuiper, *Le récit de la coupe de Bathyclès dans les* Iambes *de Callimaque*, in *REG* 29 (1916), p. 404-429.
J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978.
H.W. Parke – D.E.W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, I. *The History*, Oxford 1956.
F. Pfister, art. *Myson* (1), in *RE* 16,1 (1933), col. 1192-1194.
K. Trampedach, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994.
P. von der Mühll, *Antiker Historismus in Plutarchs Biographie des Solon*, in *Klio* 35 (1942), p. 89-102.
F. Wehrli, *ΛΑΘΕ ΒΙΩΣΑΣ. Studien zur ältesten Ethik bei den Griechen*, Leipzig - Berlin 1931.
C. Wendel, *Leandrios*, in *Hermes* 70 (1935), p. 356-360.
W. Wiersma, *The Seven Sages and the Prize of Wisdom*, in *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 3, 1 (1934), p. 150-154.
H. Wulf, *De fabellis cum collegii septem sapientium memoria coniunctis quaestiones criticae*, in AA. VV., *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses* XIII, Halle 1897, p. 161-216.

1007. Euthyphron, son of Herakleides Pontikos
(2nd half 4th cent. B.C.)

T

(1) DIOG. LAERT. 1,107: Εὐθύφρων δ' ὁ Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ Ποντικοῦ (F 18 WEHRLI VII) κτλ. (cf. F 1).

F

(1) DIOG. LAERT. 1,106-107: (106) Λέγεται δὴ πρός τινος Ἀναχάρσιδος πυνθανομένου εἴ τις αὐτοῦ σοφώτερος εἴη, τὴν Πυθίαν εἰπεῖν ἅπερ προείρηται ἐν τῷ Θαλοῦ βίῳ ὑπὲρ Χίλωνος (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,30)·

Οἰταῖόν τινά φημι Μύσωνα ἐν Χηνὶ γενέσθαι
σοῦ μᾶλλον πραπίδεσσιν ἀρηρότα πευκαλίμῃσι.

(...) (107) Ἄλλοι δὲ τὸν χρησμὸν οὕτως ἔχειν φασί " Ἠτεῖόν τινά φημι·" καὶ ζητοῦσι τί ἐστιν ὁ Ἠτεῖος. Παρμενίδης μὲν οὖν δῆμον εἶναι Λακωνικῆς, ὅθεν εἶναι τὸν Μύσωνα. Σωσικράτης (F 9 GIANNATTASIO ANDRIA; cf. *FGrHist* IV A4 1041) δ' ἐν Διαδοχαῖς, ἀπὸ μὲν πατρὸς Ἠτεῖον εἶναι, ἀπὸ δὲ μητρὸς Χηνέα. Εὐθύφρων δ' ὁ Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ Ποντικοῦ (F 18 WEHRLI VII), Κρῆτά φησιν εἶναι· Ἠτείαν γὰρ πόλιν εἶναι Κρήτης. Ἀναξίλαος (*FHG* II p. 84 *sub fine* ; *FGrHist* IV A 7) δ' Ἀρκάδα.

---

4 εἰπεῖν *codd.* : ἀνειπεῖν *Casaub.* : ἀνελεῖν *Richards* **13** Ἀναξίλαος *codd.* : Ἀναξιλαίδης *coni. Schwartz*

1007. Euthyphron, son of Herakleides Pontikos
(2nd half 4th cent. B.C.)

T

1 Euthyphron, the son of Herakleides Pontikos etc. (cf. F 1).

F

1 It is reported that when Anacharsis inquired whether there were anyone wiser than himself, the Pythian priestess gave the response which has already been quoted in the *Life of Thales* as her reply to a question by Chilon:

Myson of Chen in Oita; this is he
Who for wiseheartedness surpasseth thee.

(...) Others cite the first line of the oracle differently, "Myson [of Chen] the Eteian", and inquire what "the Eteian" means. Parmenides claims that Etis is a district in Lakonia to which Myson belonged. Sosikrates in his *Successions of Philosophers* makes him come from Etis on his father's side and from Chen on his mother's. Euthyphron, the son of Herakleides Pontikos, states that he was a Cretan, Eteia being a city on the island of Crete. Anaxilaos states that he was an Arcadian.

1007. Euthyphron, son of Herakleides Pontikos
(2nd half 4th cent. B.C.)

Introduction

The passage under discussion is the only place in the whole of ancient literature where mention is made of E. and any literary activity on his part[1]. Since E.'s father Herakleides of Pontos, the famous disciple of Plato, lived approximately between *c.* 380 and 310 B.C.[2], it is clear that E. mainly lived and worked in the second half of the fourth century B.C.[3].

E. is cited here by Diogenes Laertios as his source for the Cretan origin of the sage Myson, one of several hypotheses that did the rounds in antiquity on this issue. Unfortunately the quotation does not provide us with the title of E.'s work. We do know that his father also wrote on the Seven Sages: two fragments testify to this[4]. It should be noted, however, that there are no indications that Herakleides wrote a separate treatise on the *collegium* of Wise Men: one of the two fragments is effectively said to be derived from the work Περὶ ἀρχῆς[5], and no title dealing specifically with the Seven Sages is listed in the catalogue of Herakleides' writings given by Diogenes Laertios (at 5,86-88 = F 22 WEHRLI VII). As it is the various legends which

---

[1] See JACOBY (1907: 1518).

[2] Any doubts about the identification of E.'s father as the famous Platonist can safely be scotched in view of the fact that the name of the latter's father was also Euthyphron: cf. DIOG. LAERT. 5,86 (= F 3 WEHRLI VII); 5,91 (= F 14a WEHRLI VII); in *Suda* H 461 *s.v.* Ἡρακλείδης (F 2 WEHRLI VII) Herakleides' father is called Euphron, but this can easily be corrected into Euthyphron. Hence we can conclude that Euthyphron was Herakleides' eldest son; nothing else is known about Herakleides' family. See WEHRLI VII (1969[2]: 59 on F 1-2); GOTTSCHALK (1980: 2). For a discussion of the chronology of Herakleides' life and his relationship to Plato and Aristotle (and their respective schools), see WEHRLI VII (1969[2]: 59-60 on F 1-2,3; 63 on F 14-17); GOTTSCHALK (1980: 3-6).

[3] Thus he should, for obvious chronological reasons, be distinguished from the titular hero of Plato's early dialogue on piety entitled *Euthyphro*; besides modern scholarship tends to identify the latter with Euthyphron of the deme Prospalta in Attica, the seer (μάντις) mentioned several times in PLAT. *Crat.* (396d; 399a, e; 407d; 409d; 428c): see, for instance, KIRCHNER (1907: 1517); WALKER (1984: 9).

[4] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,94 (on Periandros), from the work Περὶ ἀρχῆς (F 144 WEHRLI VII); 1,25 (on Thales), which in the opinion of WEHRLI VII (F 45) was derived from the Περὶ βίων but which might just as well be assigned to the Περὶ ἀρχῆς, too (especially if ἰδιαστής is interpreted as a synonym for ἰδιώτης and is attributed a political sense, "private, without political function").

[5] See the previous note.

circulated on the subject of the Seven Sages in antiquity, pre-eminently lent themselves to incorporation into various kinds of writings: mere collections of (biographical) anecdotes and sayings, but also, for example, ethical treatises and books on the various ways of life. Accordingly it is impossible to say whether E. wrote a (biographical) monograph on the Seven Sages, or simply touched on the subject in another work.

Commentary

F

(1) Myson of Chen was undoubtedly associated with the group of the Seven Sages in antiquity: his name was not included in what finally became the standard composition[6], but he was referred to as a member of the venerable group by Plato and Eudoxos of Knidos[7], and hence writers about the tradition could not neglect him and duly continued to record him as one of the 'variable members'[8]. The ancients already noted that the otherwise obscure Myson figured on Plato's list and the Corinthian tyrant Periandros did not; accordingly, it was concluded that the Academic had deliberately excluded the latter and introduced the former because he was more worthy of the title of sage[9]. A number of modern scholars have taken this to mean that Myson was a later (possibly only a fourth-century) addition to the

---

6 See the group of the Seven Wise Men as given by Stob. *Ecl.* 3,1.172 p. 111-125 Hense I, a list which goes back to Demetrios of Phaleron (F 114 Wehrli IV): Kleobulos, Solon, Chilon, Thales, Pittakos, Bias and Periandros. Barkowski (1923: 2244) enumerates all ancient authors who seem to have followed this particular version.

7 *Cf.* Plat. *Prot.* 343a (a passage which is quoted in full by Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Χήν, and which is also referred to in Diog. Laert. 1,41; 1,108); Diog. Laert. 1,30 = Eudoxos of Knidos F 371 Lasserre = *FGrHist* 1006 F 1. Already Hipponax (second half sixth century B.C.) knew Myson as a sage, witness Diog. Laert. 1,107 (= F 65 Degani); on this passage, see Degani (1991²: 82) and the commentary on 1006 F 1, p. 174-175.

8 *Cf.* Aristoxenos *ap.* Diog. Laert. 1,108 (= F 130 Wehrli II); Hermippos of Smyrna *ap.* Diog. Laert. 1,42 (= F 10 Wehrli Suppl. I = *FGrHist* 1026 F 10); Hippobotos *ap.* Diog. Laert. 1,42 (= F 6 Gigante; cf. *FGrHist* IV A 4, 1039); Diod. *Bibl.* 9,7; Paus. 10,24.1; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 14,59.5; Diog. Laert. 1,13; Theod. *Graec. aff. cur.* 5,63.

9 Cf. Diod. *Bibl.* 9,7; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 14,59.5. On this issue, see the forthcoming commentary on Hermippos *FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 11 in fascicle IV A 3.

collegium of Seven[10]. Against this view it has been argued that the few stories that were told about Myson point to the archaic period. At that time several different versions of the list of seven names must have been in circulation[11], and so Myson may, according to a specific branch of the tradition, have been an original holder of a place among the Seven, who in later times, when the tradition was streamlined, had to yield to a more famous name[12]. Accordingly, Plato might well have given preference to an old list on which Myson did and Periandros did not occur[13].

In spite of his association with the Seven Sages Myson was already a thoroughly obscure figure in antiquity, about whom precious little information was available, and even the few facts reported about him were disputed[14]. According to Aristoxenos of Tarentum, the reason why Myson remained obscure and why some writers even left him out of the group of the Seven Wise Men was that he did not originate from a city but a village, and an insignificant one at that[15]. As a matter of fact his birthplace was so obscure that the ancients did not even know where he had been born. To be sure, Myson is consistently mentioned as ὁ Χηνεύς[16], referring to a village Chen (Χήν) or Chenai (Χῆναι or Χηναί), but the discussion centred on the exact location of that village, which is only ever cited in ancient literature in connection with Myson.

We are best informed of the uncertainty surrounding the sage's origin through the full context of the E.-F proper, in which Diogenes dwells on the various theories in circulation on the issue. Judging from the Laertian's discussion, the point of departure for the whole discussion was the text, or rather, the opening words of the oracle

---

[10] Cf. e.g. PFISTER (1933: 1192); DÖRRIE (1969: 1533); WEHRLI Suppl. I (1974: 53).

[11] See the forthcoming commentary on HERMIPPOS OF SMYRNA, *FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 10.

[12] Compare what ARISTOXENOS OF TARENTUM had to say about this: cf. *supra*, p. 185 n. 8.

[13] See KINDSTRAND (1981: 33-34 + n. 4; 38; 40-42). Though Plato's is the earliest known list of a group of seven sages, the tradition itself must have been considerably older: cf. *supra*, p. 119 + n. 23.

[14] His '*vita*' in the first book of Diogenes' work (1,106-108) is by far the shortest one in that book, which is a clear indication of his obscurity. On Myson, see PFISTER (1933: 1192-1194); DÖRRIE (1969: 1533).

[15] Cf. once again the reference made above, p. 185 n. 8.

[16] In addition to the references in the following footnotes, cf. PLAT. *Prot.* 343a; MUSONIOS *ap.* STOB. *Ecl.* 4,15.18 p. 381-382 HENSE II; MAX. TYR. 25, 1; *Suda* M 1480 *s.v.* Μύσωνα τὸν Χηνέα.

given by Apollo in reply to the question of Anacharsis as to whether there was anyone wiser than himself. These words were variously given as Οἰταῖόν τινα φημὶ Μύσων' ἐνὶ Χηνί ("I say Myson the Oetaean of Chen is") or Ἠτεῖόν τινα φημὶ Μύσων' ἐνὶ Χηνί ("I say Myson the Eteian of Chen is"), the former version obviously being the original (and in all likelihood historically correct), and the latter being a clear example of an invention intended to make sense of a piece of information not understood (because little-known). Accordingly, Myson was said to be an inhabitant either of Chen in Oite, that is, in the central part of the mountain range due south of the valley of the river Spercheios in central Greece (south of Thessaly, west of Malis)[17]; or of Chen in Etis, the latter being a district in Lakonia[18]; or of Eteia, a

---

[17] *Cf.* DIOD. *Bibl.* 9,6-7; PAUS. 10,24.1. The Οἰταῖοι were already known to HERODOTOS (7,217); see LENK (1937: 2294-2299); KIRSTEN (1937a: 2299); KIRSTEN (1937b: 2294-2299); MEYER (1972: 265-266). On the synonymous ethnics Οἰταῖος and Οἰταιεύς, see also DITTENBERGER (1906: 174).

[18] This localization is also given by STEPH. BYZ. *s.v.* Χήν· πόλις τῆς Λακωνικῆς. Ὁ πολίτης Χηνιεύς· οὕτω γὰρ Μύσων τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν κριθέντων εἷς Χηνιεὺς ἐχρημάτιζεν; in addition, cf. STEPH. BYZ. *s.v.* Ἧτις· δῆμος Λακωνικῆς καὶ τῆς Κρήτης πόλις· ὅθεν ἦν Μύσων εἷς τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν χρηματίζων Ἠτεῖος, οὗ μέμνηται Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Πρωταγόρᾳ Χηνέα τοῦτον εἰπών. PAUS. 3,22.11 mentions that Ἧτις in Lakonia was founded by Aeneas on his way to Italy and named after his daughter Ἠτιάς (cf. also PAUS. 8,12.8). ARISTOXENOS OF TARENTUM *ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 1,108 (= F 130 WEHRLI II) may seem to be referring to this Laconian tradition (he relates an anecdote about Myson "who was spotted in Sparta"), but then again, the place where an anecdote is located does not necessarily hint at the protagonist's origin. On Etis in Lakonia, see PHILIPPSON (1907: 718); LIPPOLD (1929: 1324).

Incidentally, the Parmenides on whose authority Diogenes records this particular version of Myson's birthplace, is an utterly obscure figure: one must be really desperate to identify him either with the Eleatic philosopher [admittedly LONG II (1964: 590) does list the passage under discussion among the references to the latter, but he does not comment on this; the F is duly omitted from every available Parmenides-edition] or with the only other known namesake, a rhetorician who wrote a treatise on his art (cf. DIOG. LAERT. 9,23). Modern scholarship has been remarkably silent about this testimony, an attitude exemplified by PFISTER's remark (1933: 1194) that "mit dem (...) von Diogenes zitierten Parmenides nichts anzufangen ist." RÖPER (1870: 576) did propose to correct the name into Παρμενίσκος, the Alexandrian grammarian [2nd-1st cent. B.C.; see WENDEL (1949: 1570-1572) and SUSEMIHL II (1892: 162-164)] who is quoted in the scholia on Homer and Euripides, by Stephanos of Byzantion and in astronomical treatises connected with Aratos' Φαινόμενα, and who seems to have had a special interest in topographical questions and geographical homonyms. This emendation is hardly binding, but is interesting nonetheless, the more so in view of the fact that Parmeniskos was primarily mined as a source by Didymos, whom STEPHANOS OF BYZANTION *s.v.* Ἧτις records as having said, in the tenth book of his *Symposiaka*, that Myson was an Ἠτεῖος.

town in Crete[19]; he was even said to have been an Arcadian[20]. Finally there was a fifth version: Sosikrates of Rhodos obviously attempted to reconcile two different strands of tradition, stating that on his father's side Myson was of Chen in Laconian Etis, while his mother originally came from Chen in Oite[21].

Where E. got his information about Myson's birthplace, and how he came to associate the sage with Crete, is anyone's guess. A Cretan town by the name of Eteia is only attested in the passage under discussion and in the related *passus* in Stephanos' *Ethnica*[22], but still modern scholarship is prepared to accept the historicity of the place name, which has a clear Bronze Age origin[23]. Even so, the choice of place is odd, for in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Crete was merely a shadow of its former glory, a backwater which seemed to play no part in the major achievements of Hellenic civilization[24]. Nor did the island feature prominently in ancient legendry about the Seven Sages. In fact the only Cretan to be associated with the *collegium* was the famous wonder-worker Epimenides, who—among other things—was known for having spoken disparagingly of his fellow-

---

[19] For a parallel, see the reference to Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Ἦτις in the previous footnote. With regard to this passage it should be noted that the manuscripts read Ἠτία; in the *lectio Meinekii* this is changed into Ἦτις. As it is, *Et. M. s.v.* Δαρεῖος (p. 248,34-35 Gaisford) contains the following piece of information: Ἦτις, ὄνομα πόλεως· καὶ Ἠτεῖος, ὁ πολίτης. Gaisford preferred to read this with ms. V as Ἦλις and Ἠλεῖος, referring to *Et. M. s.v.* Ἠλεῖος on p. 426,32, but he might just as well have referred to p. 426,41, where Ἠτιεὺς is written. Casaubon, on the other hand, proposed to alter the manuscript text into Ἤτεια, precisely on the basis of the *passus* under discussion—and indeed Stephanos has most likely derived his information from this passage, since he uses the same terms δῆμος Λακωνικῆς and Κρήτης πόλις.

[20] The Anaxilaos cited by Diogenes Laertios for this alternative is another noble unknown (see the forthcoming commentary in *FGrHist* IV A 7), nor is it clear where he got his information from. Possibly he had an inkling that Etis was situated on the Peloponnese, and subsequently he may have found that primitive and isolated Arkadia was pre-eminently suited for having produced the simple and unknown peasant that Myson in tradition was made out to be.

[21] This interpretation of the *passus* in 1,107 is facilitated by Diogenes' earlier reference to Sosikrates at 1,106: Μύσων Στρύμωνος, ὥς φησι Σωσικράτης (F 8 Giannattasio Andria; cf. *FGrHist* IV A 5, 1041) Ἕρμιππον (*FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 19) παρατιθέμενος, τὸ γένος Χηνεύς, ἀπὸ κώμης τινὸς Οἰταικῆς ἢ Λακωνικῆς. At any rate it is not possible, *pace* Pfister (1933: 1193), to ascribe to Sosikrates (author of a Κρητικά: *FGrHist* 461 F 1-7) the tradition which traced Myson's roots back to Eteia on Crete.

[22] Cf. *supra*, p. 187 + n. 18.

[23] See Bürchner (1907: 706); Id. (1922: 1814). On the origin of the name 'Eteia', see Hutchinson (1962: 319); Willetts (1965: 34-35).

[24] Thus Willetts (1965: 4).

islanders, calling them "inveterate liars, bad animals, lazy gluttons"[25].

Finally, it may be observed that Diogenes' text could give the impression that E. did not speak of the village Chen anymore, but only tried to give an explanation for the ethnic Ἠτεῖος, speaking of the *town* Eteia (as opposed to a *region* such as Oite or Etis, in which Chen would have been located). However, since the text of the oracle which served as the starting-point for the whole discussion, speaks clearly of Μύσων' ἐνὶ Χηνί and since the controversy (if Diogenes Laertios' survey of the problem is accurate and complete) never touched on the latter detail, it is reasonable to assume that E. kept it in his story; possibly he identified Chen as a hamlet of the Cretan city, or else he may have thought that Eteia was a city which resulted from a *synoikismos* involving, among other things, a village by the name of Chen[26].

Jan BOLLANSÉE

---

[25] On Epimenides' association with the Seven Wise Men, cf. LEANDR(I)OS OF MILETOS *ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 1,40 (492 F 16), and also ARISTOT. *Ath. Pol.* 1 (where Epimenides is presented as a contemporary of Solon); a full discussion of this topic will be given in the forthcoming commentary on HERMIPPOS 1026 F 12 (*FGrHist* IV A 3). For Epimenides' famous saying, cf. ST. PAUL, *Tit.* 1,12 (3 B 1 DIELS – KRANZ): "Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί."

[26] Like Laconian Etis, one of three cities which were merged in order to form the larger city of Boiai (due west of the Promontory Malea, in the south-eastern corner of Lakonia): cf. PAUS. 3,22.11 and see OBERHUMMER (1897: 627-628); PHILIPPSON (1907: 718).

Text editions and translations

H. DEGANI, Hipponax, *Testimonia et fragmenta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Stuttgart - Leipzig 1991².

T. GAISFORD, *Etymologicon Magnum seu verius lexicon saepissime vocabulorum origines indagans ex pluribus lexicis scholiastis et grammaticis anonymi cuiusdam opera concinnatum*, Oxford 1848 (= Amsterdam 1967).

R. GIANNATTASIO ANDRIA, *I frammenti delle "Successioni dei filosofi"*, Napoli 1989.

M. GIGANTE, *Frammenti di Ippoboto. Contributo alla storia della storiografia filosofica*, in A. MASTROCINQUE (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves* (Università di Venezia. Facoltà di lettere e filosofia 7), Padova 1983, p. 151-193.

*H.S. LONG, Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, 2 vol. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964.

C. MÜLLER, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* II, Paris 1848.

F. WEHRLI, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentare*, VII. *Herakleides Pontikos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1969².

F. WEHRLI, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentare*, Suppl. I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel - Stuttgart 1974.

Secondary literature

O. BARKOWSKI, art. *Sieben Weise*, in *RE* 2A, 2 (1923), col. 2242-2264.

L. BÜRCHNER, art. *Chen*, in *RE* 3,2 (1899), col. 2235.

L. BÜRCHNER, art. *Eteia*, in *RE* 6,1 (1907), col. 706.

L. BÜRCHNER, art. *Kreta, XX. Chorographie und Topographie Kretas zu altgriechischer Zeit*, in *RE* 11,2 (1922), col. 1812-1815.

W. DITTENBERGER, *Ethnika und Verwandtes*, in *Hermes* 41 (1906), p. 78-102; 161-219.

H. DÖRRIE, art. *Myson* (1), in *DKP* 3 (1969), col. 1533.

H.B. GOTTSCHALK, *Heraclides of Pontus*, Oxford 1980.

R.W. HUTCHINSON, *Prehistoric Crete*, Harmondsworth 1962 (= 1963).

F. JACOBY, art. *Euthyphron* (2), in *RE* 6,1 (1907), col. 1518.

J.F. KINDSTRAND, *Anacharsis. The Legend and the Apophthegmata*, Uppsala 1981.

J. KIRCHNER, art. *Euthyphron* (1), in *RE* 6,1 (1907), col. 1517.

E. KIRSTEN, art. *Oitaioi*, in *RE* 17,2 (1937), col. 2289-2294 (= 1937a).

E. KIRSTEN, art. *Oite* (2), in *RE* 17,2 (1937), col. 2299 (= 1937b).

B. LENK, art. *Oite* (1), in *RE* 17,2 (1937), col. 2294-2299.

G. LIPPOLD, art. *Sparta*, in *RE* 3 A 2 (1929), col. 1265-1528.

E. MEYER, art. *Oite. Oitaioi*, in *DKP* 4 (1972), col. 265-266.

E. OBERHUMMER, art. *Boiai* (1), in *RE* 3,1 (1897), col. 627-628.

F. PFISTER, art. *Myson* (1), in *RE* 16,1 (1933), col. 1192-1194.

A. PHILIPPSON, art. *Etis*, in *RE* 6,1 (1907), col. 718.

G. RÖPER, *Zu Laertios Diogenes I*, in *Philologus* 30 (1870), p. 557-577.

I. WALKER, *Plato's Euthyphro. Introduction and Notes*, Chico 1984.

C. WENDEL, art. *Parmeniskos* (3), in *RE* 18,4 (1949), col. 1570-1572.

R.F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete. A Social History From Early Times until the Roman Occupation*, London - Toronto 1965 (= 1974).

1008. Hermodoros of Syracuse
(4th cent. B.C.)

T

1 (F 1 Isnardi Parente) Philod. *Hist. Acad.* col. 5,32-33; 6,6-10 p. 181; 184 Gaiser:

col. 5,32 (...) Πλάτωνος μ[αθη-]
[τα]ὶ ἦσ[α]ν (...)
col. 6,6 (...) Ἑρ-
μ[ό]δωρος Συρακόσιος ὁ καὶ πε-
ρὶ α[ὐ]τοῦ (*sc.* Πλάτωνος) γράψας καὶ τοὺς λό-
γους εἰς Σικελίαν [μετ]αφέ-
ρ[ω]ν κτλ.

2 (F 2, 3 Isnardi Parente = *Bausteine* 2.1a-b Dörrie I) **a)** Cic. *Ad Att.* 13,21a.1: Dic mihi, placetne tibi primum edere iniussu meo? Hoc ne Hermodorus quidem faciebat, is qui Platonis libros solitus est divulgare, ex quo "λόγοισιν Ἑρμόδωρος." **b)** Zenob. 5,6 p. 116 Leutsch – Schneidewin I: Λόγοισιν Ἑρμόδωρος ἐμπορεύεται· ὁ Ἑρμόδωρος ἀκροατὴς γέγονε Πλάτωνος καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συντεθειμένους λογισμοὺς κομίζων εἰς Σικελίαν ἐπώλει. Εἴρηται οὖν διὰ τοῦτο ἡ παροιμία. **c)** *Suda* Λ 661 *s.v.* Λόγοισιν Ἑρμόδωρος ἐμπορεύεται· ὁ Ἑρμόδωρος, ἀκροατὴς γενόμενος Πλάτωνι, τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συντεθειμένους λόγους κομίζων εἰς Σικελίαν ἐπώλει.

3 (Cf. F 2a-b) **a)** Simpl. *Comm. in Arist. Phys.* p. 247,30-34 Diels: Ἐπειδὴ πολλαχοῦ μέμνηται τοῦ Πλάτωνος ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ὡς τὴν ὕλην μέγα καὶ μικρὸν λέγοντος, ἰστέον ὅτι ὁ Πορφύριος ἱστορεῖ τὸν Δερκυλλίδην ἐν τῷ ῑᾱ τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας, ἔνθα περὶ ὕλης ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον, Ἑρμοδώρου τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἑταίρου λέξιν παραγράφειν ἐκ τῆς Περὶ Πλάτωνος αὐτοῦ συγγραφῆς, ἐξ ἧς δηλοῦται ὅτι κτλ. (F 2 follows). **b)** Simpl. *Comm. in Arist.*

---

9 *suppl. Gomperz* **14** λόγοισιν *VB Gaisfordus* : λόγους *Schottus* **14** γέγονε : ἐγένετο *VB* **15** αὐτοῦ *VBP Gaisfordus* : αὐτῷ *Schottus* **15** λογισμούς : λόγους *VB* **16** Εἴρηται οὖν διὰ τοῦτο ἡ παροιμία : ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία *VB*

1008. Hermodoros of Syracuse
(4th cent. B.C.)

T

1 The following were pupils of Plato (...) Hermodoros of Syracuse, who wrote a work on him (*sc.* Plato) and who transferred his dialogues to Sicily; etc.

2 a) Tell me: do you take pleasure in editing a work of mine first, even before I order you to do so? Not even Hermodoros did that, he who used to publish Plato's books, whence the saying "Hermodoros makes capital out of dialogues." **b)** "Hermodoros makes capital out of dialogues": after he had become a pupil of Plato, he shipped the latter's dialogues to Sicily and sold them. Hence the proverb. **c)** "Hermodoros makes capital out of dialogues": after Hermodoros had become a pupil of Plato, he shipped the latter's dialogues to Sicily and sold them.

3 a) As Aristotle often mentions that Plato called matter the great-and-small, it should be known that Porphyry relates that Derkyllides in the eleventh book of his *Philosophy of Plato*, where he speaks about matter, quotes a passage of Hermodoros, the disciple of Plato, from his book *On Plato*, from which appears that etc. (F 2a follows). **b)** (...) was made clear by Hermodoros, the

Phys. p. 256,32-33 Diels: (...) ἐδήλωσεν Ἑρμόδωρος ὁ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἑταῖρος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Πλάτωνος βιβλίῳ τὰ δοκοῦντα τῷ Πλάτωνι ἔν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ περὶ τῆς ὕλης γράφων κτλ. (F 2b follows).

F

ΠΕΡΙ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ
(F 1-2)

1 (F 4 Isnardi Parente) **a)** Diog. Laert. 2,106 (= [Hesych. Mil.] *De vir. ill.* 27 Εὐκλείδης p. 19 Flach =—Döring = II A 5 Giannantoni I): Πρὸς τοῦτον (*sc.* Εὐκλείδην; I i A 4B Döring = II A 5 Giannantoni I) φησιν ὁ Ἑρμόδωρος ἀφικέσθαι Πλάτωνα καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς φιλοσόφους μετὰ τὴν Σωκράτους τελευτήν, δείσαντες τὴν ὠμότητα τῶν τυράννων. **b)** Diog. Laert. 3,6 (F 5 Isnardi Parente): Εἶτα γενόμενος ὀκτὼ καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη, καθά φησιν Ἑρμόδωρος, εἰς Μέγαρα πρὸς Εὐκλείδην (I i A 4A Döring = II A 5 Giannantoni I) σὺν καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶ Σωκρατικοῖς ὑπεχώρησεν.

2 (F 7, 8 Isnardi parente = *Bausteine* 2.2a-b Dörrie I = *Baustein* 124.1 Dörrie – Baltes IV) **a)** Simpl. *Comm. in Arist. Phys.* p. 247,30-248,15 Diels: Ἐπειδὴ πολλαχοῦ μέμνηται τοῦ Πλάτωνος ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ὡς τὴν ὕλην μέγα καὶ μικρὸν λέγοντος, ἰστέον ὅτι ὁ Πορφύριος ἱστορεῖ τὸν Δερκυλλίδην ἐν τῷ ι̅α̅ τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας, ἔνθα περὶ ὕλης ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον, Ἑρμοδώρου τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἑταίρου λέξιν παραγράφειν ἐκ τῆς Περὶ Πλάτωνος αὐτοῦ συγγραφῆς, ἐξ ἧς δηλοῦται ὅτι τὴν ὕλην ὁ Πλάτων κατὰ τὸ ἄπειρον καὶ ἀόριστον ὑποτιθέμενος ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνων αὐτὴν ἐδήλου τῶν τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον ἐπιδεχομένων, ὧν καὶ τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ μικρόν ἐστιν. Εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι "τῶν ὄντων τὰ μὲν καθ᾽ αὑτὰ εἶναι λέγειν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἵππον, τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἕτερα, καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν ὡς πρὸς ἐναντία, ὡς ἀγαθὸν κακῷ, τὰ δὲ ὡς πρός τι, καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν ὡς ὡρισμένα, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἀόριστα" ἐπάγει· "καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς μέγα πρὸς μικρὸν λεγόμενα πάντα ἔχειν τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον· ἔστι <γὰρ> μᾶλλον εἶναι μεῖζον καὶ ἔλαττον εἰς ἄπειρον φερόμενα· ὡσαύτως δε καὶ

---

50 γάρ *omiserunt plures codd.* : ὡς τῷ μᾶλλον εἶναι μεῖζον κτλ. *suspicatus est Diels*

disciple of Plato, who in his book *On Plato* wrote down Plato's doctrines, including that on matter (...) (F 2b follows).

F

ON PLATO
(F 1-2)

1 a) Hermodoros relates that Plato and the other philosophers came to him (*sc.* Eukleides) after Sokrates' death, dreading the cruelty of the tyrants. **b)** Then, at the age of twenty-eight, according to Hermodoros, he withdrew to Eukleides in Megara together with certain other disciples of Sokrates.

2 a) As Aristotle often mentions that Plato called matter the great-and-small, it should be known that Porphyry relates that Derkyllides in the eleventh book of his *Philosophy of Plato*, where he speaks about matter, quotes a passage of Hermodoros, the disciple of Plato, from his book *On Plato*, from which appears that Plato admitted matter in the sense of the infinite and indeterminate, and that he showed with this that it belongs to things which admit of a more and less, to which belongs also the great-and-small. First, namely, he says: "He (*sc.* Plato) says that of all existing things certain things exist by themselves, such as man and horse, and others with relation to other things. Of this latter group some are related to a counterpart such as good and bad, and others simply to something else. And of these some are limited, others undetermined." He (*sc.* Hermodoros) continues: "And all that is called great with relation to small, has a more and less in it. For it is possible to be greater and smaller *ad infinitum*, and in the same way

πλατύτερον καὶ στενότερον καὶ βαρύτερον καὶ κουφότερον καὶ πάντα τὰ οὕτως λεγόμενα εἰς ἄπειρον οἰσθήσεται. Τὰ δὲ ὡς τὸ ἴσον καὶ τὸ μένον καὶ τὸ ἡρμοσμένον λεγόμενα οὐκ ἔχειν τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧτον, τὰ δὲ ἐναντία τούτων ἔχειν. Ἔστι γὰρ μᾶλλον ἄνισον ἀνίσου καὶ κινούμενον κινουμένου καὶ ἀνάρμοστον ἀναρμόστου, ὥστε αὐτῶν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν συζυγιῶν πάντα πλὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς στοιχείου τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον δέδεκται. Ὥστε ἄστατον καὶ ἄμορφον καὶ ἄπεριον καὶ οὐκ ὂν τὸ τοιοῦτον λέεσθαι κατὰ ἀπόφασιν τοῦ ὄντος. Τῷ τοιούτῳ δὲ οὐ προσήκειν οὔτε ἀρχῆς οὔτε οὐσίας, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκρισίᾳ τινὶ φέρεσθαι. Δηλοῖ γὰρ ὡς ὃν τρόπον τὸ αἴτιον κυρίως καὶ διαφέροντι τρόπῳ τὸ ποιοῦν ἐστιν, οὕτως καὶ ἀρχή, ἡ δὲ ὕλη οὐκ ἀρχή." Διὸ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Πλάτωνα ἐλέγετο μία, ὅτι ἡ ἀρχή. **b)** SIMPL. *Comm. in Arist. Phys.* p. 256,31-257,4 DIELS: Ὅτι δὲ ὡς πρώτην αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀξιοῖ λέγειν, ἐδήλωσεν Ἑρμόδωρος ὁ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἑταῖρος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Πλάτωνος βιβλίῳ τὰ δοκοῦντα τῷ Πλάτωνι ἔν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ περὶ τῆς ὕλης γράφων, ὡς ὁ Δερκυλλίδης ἱστόρησε. Τὸ δὲ συμπέρασμα ἐγὼ τῶν εἰρημένων παραθήσομαι· "ὥστε ἄστατον καὶ ἄμορφον καὶ ἄπειρον καὶ οὐκ ὂν τὸ τοιοῦτον λέγεσθαι, κατὰ ἀπόφασιν τοῦ ὄντος. Τῷ τοιούτῳ δὲ οὐ προσήκει οὔτε ἀρχῆς οὔτε οὐσίας. Ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκρισίᾳ τινὶ φέρεσθαι, δηλοῖ γὰρ ὡς ὃν τρόπον τὸ αἴτιον κυρίως καὶ διαφέρον τρόπῳ τὸ ποιοῦν ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ ἀρχή. Ἡ δὲ ὕλη οὐκ ἀρχή." Ὃ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Πλάτωνα ἐλέγετο μία ὅτι εἴη ἀρχή.

---

52 βαρύτερον : βαθύτερον *a* 57 αὐτῶν : τούτων *coni. Zeller* : αὖ τῶν *Heinze (1892 : 38 n. 1)* 58 δέδεκται *sic Heinze (1892: 38 n. 1)-Van der Wielen (1941: 115)-Gaiser, Test. Plat. 54a* : δεδεγμένον *codd. et Diels* : <κατὰ> πάντα δεδεγμένων *corr. Zeller* 71 ἀκρισίᾳ : ἀκρασίᾳ *a F*

also broader and narrower, heavier and lighter, and all such things will go on *ad infinitum*. But of things like the equal and the permanent and the arranged there is no more and less; of their opposites, however, there is. For 'unequal' admits of a difference of degree, and so does 'moving' and 'unarranged'. Consequently of both last-mentioned groups of pairs all have accepted the more and less, except the principle that is one. Hence all these things (*sc*. that admit of the more and less) must be called unstable, formless, unlimited and non-being, because being is denied of it. And to such things it neither belongs to have a beginning nor to have being, but it is proper to them to move to an extent in a state of disorder. For it is clear that, just as the efficient cause is the real and specific one of its sort, so is the principle as well. And (therefore) matter is not a principle." And hence it was said that for Plato and his pupils there was only one principle. **b)** That it (*sc*. matter) cannot be called a first principle was made clear by Hermodoros, the disciple of Plato, who in his book *On Plato* wrote down Plato's doctrines, including that on matter, as Derkyllides relates. I will quote the conclusion of what he has said: "Hence all these things (*sc*. that admit of the more and less) must be called unstable, formless, unlimited and non-being, because being is denied of them. And to such things it neither belongs to have a beginning nor to have being, but it is proper to them to move to an extent in a state of disorder. For it is clear that, just as the efficient cause is the real and specific one of its sort, so is the principle as well. And (therefore) matter is not a principle." And hence it was said that for Plato and his pupils there was only one principle.

1008. Hermodoros of Syracuse
(4th cent. B.C.)

Introduction

H. of Syracuse, said to have been a pupil of Plato (T 1-3), presumably got in touch with his master in the course of one of the latter's sojourns in the Sicilian metropolis. If he left Sicily at all and followed Plato to Athens he apparently did not lose contact with his native land: he is said to have sold copies of Plato's dialogues there, which may have earned him a lot of scorn in certain quarters, even within the Academy itself, and which in any case made him the butt of an abrasive proverb (T 2 with commentary).

Two works can be attributed with certainty to H.: a monograph *On Plato* (T 1-3) and a treatise *On the Mathematical Sciences* (Περὶ μαθημάτων). In the latter, a mere two F of which remain[1], he may have attempted to write a history of science and to trace back all knowledge in this field to the head of the Persian *Magoi*, Zoroaster; at any rate H., through the two extant F, reveals himself as one of those Academics who had a vivid interest in the figure of Zoroaster and who attempted to link the great Persian *Magos* with Greek history and culture[2]. In addition H. might have written a third work on the

[1] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 1,2 (B 1a BIDEZ – CUMONT = F 6 ISNARDI PARENTE), where Zoroaster is dated to 5000 years before the Sack of Troy; 1,8 [D 2 BIDEZ – CUMONT = F 6a ISNARDI PARENTE, edited in ISNARDI PARENTE (1987: 292-294)], where a Greek (erroneous) etymology is given for Zoroaster's name. The same date for Zoroaster as that proposed by Hermodoros is found in PLUT. *De Is. et Os.* 369e (= D 4 BIDEZ – CUMONT), but without specific reference to the Platonist.

[2] On the presumed contents of Περὶ μαθημάτων, see KRÄMER (1983: 131); ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 438-439). On the first generation of Academics and their interest in the lore of the Persian *Magoi*, see JAEGER (1948²: 131-136); KOSTER (1951); JAEGER (1955²: 133-138); ZELLER – MONDOLFO II 3.2 (1974: 846-855); CHROUST (1980: 342-357); DÖRRIE II (1990: 166-218; 425-505); KINGSLEY (1995: 183 n. 64; 199-205). In connection with the Laertian passage 1,2 ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 438-439) made the at first sight interesting, but ultimately redundant suggestion that H., like Eudoxos of Knidos, *might* have regarded Plato as "Zoroaster *redivivus*", which he *might* in turn have translated into a legendary biographical element (probably the Italian scholar had in mind the remotely similar case of the divine ancestry—descent from Apollo—attributed to Plato by Speusippos: cf. 1009 F 1). This suggestion seems to rest on an erroneous understanding of the commentary by LASSERRE (1966: 254-255) on Eudoxos' F 342, where, *pace* Isnardi Parente, it is *denied* that Eudoxos regarded Plato as a second Zoroaster. To be sure Isnardi Parente herself immediately undermined her proposal by referring to SPÖRRI (1957: 215-217), which makes her original suggestion even more peculiar. In fact there is no evidence whatever that any member of the Academy regarded Plato as the reincarnation of Zoroaster, and hence there is no ground for holding that H. did so either.

relationship between nobility of birth and nobleness of mind: so much can possibly be inferred from a *passus* in the pseudo-Plutarchean treatise *Pro Nobilitate*, where an otherwise unspecified H. is cited on the topic[3]. The evidence, however, is not so unequivocal as to warrant certain attribution to H. of Syracuse: on the one hand the issue of virtue and noble birth was first put on the philosophical agenda by the sophists[4] and was also tackled, among others, by Plato and Aristotle[5]; on the other hand, the position adopted in the discussion by the H. in Pseudo-Plutarch's text is completely divergent not just from that of the sophists, but from that of Plato's too. Hence the matter of authorship has still to be decided[6].

Turning to *On Plato*, now, the first observation to be made is that the work can be inserted in a whole series of writings on Plato (reportedly) composed by the first generation of pupils after him[7]: Aristotle would have authored an encomiastic work (a λόγος ἐγκωμιαστικός) in honour of his teacher[8]; Speusippos, Plato's nephew and successor as scholarch of the Academy, wrote *Plato's Funeral Banquet* (Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον) which is probably the same as his *Encomium of Plato* (Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον)[9]; Xenokrates, who succeeded Speusippos as head of the school, is credited with a work *On the Life of Plato* (Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου)[10]; Philippos of Opus, Plato's personal secretary, wrote

[3] Cf. [PLUT.] *Pro nob.* 7 p. 218-220 BERNARDAKIS VII = F 9 ISNARDI PARENTE. On the Pseudo-Plutarchean treatise, see SANDBACH (1969: 405-406).

[4] Cf., for instance, LYKOPHRON 83,4 DIELS – KRANZ; ANTIPHON 87 B 44 fragm. B col. 1,35-2,35 DIELS – KRANZ; EUR. *El.* 37-38; 369-376; *Phoen.* 442; F 22; 53; 59; 95; 285,11-14 NAUCK[2].

[5] For Plato, cf. *Resp.* 3,415b-c; *Theaet.* 174e-175b; for Aristotle a work entitled Περὶ εὐγενείας is explicitly attested: cf. DIOG. LAERT. 5,22, as well as F 91-94 ROSE, F 1-4 Ross and F 68-71 GIGON. In addition, cf. [PLAT.] *Div.* 10 DIOG. LAERT. p. 12-13 MUTSCHMANN; *Div.* 10-11 COD. MARC. p. 43-44 MUTSCHMANN.

[6] This view is held cautiously by ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 444), as NATORP (1912: 861) did before her. KRÄMER (1983: 121; 131) has no such doubts about the passage in question: he categorically assigns the work to H. of Syracuse, and he even gratuitously entitles it Περὶ εὐγενείας.

[7] See LEISEGANG (1950: 2343); SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 5; 7-8; 204-205); DÖRRIE – BALTES III (1993: 235-236).

[8] Cf. OLYMP. *Comm. Plat. In Gorg.* 41,9 (= F 650 ROSE = F 708 GIGON), who characterizes the work thus: ἐκτίθεται γὰρ τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ (*sc.* τοῦ Πλάτωνος) καὶ ὑπερεπαινεῖ. In addition Aristotle's Πλατωνικά may have been devoted exclusively to Plato's teachings (cf. PLUT. *Adv. Col.* 1118c = F 1 ROSE = Περὶ φιλοσοφίας F 1 ROSS = F 709 GIGON), but this is uncertain.

[9] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 3,2; 4,5; APUL. *Plat.* 1,2 (183-184). For the argument that both titles refer to the same work, which presumably was an encomium delivered (or set) at the funeral banquet for Plato, see the commentary on 1009 F 1-2 in the present volume.

[10] Cf. SIMPL. *Comm. in Arist. Phys.* p. 1165,33-38 DIELS; *Comm. In Arist. Cael.* p. 12,21-26; p. 87,20-26 HEIBERG (= F 264-266 ISNARDI PARENTE = 1010 F 1a-c).

On Plato (Περὶ Πλάτωνος)[11]; and, finally, both Erastos and Asklepiades collected *Memorabilia of Plato* (᾿Απομνημονεύματα Πλάτωνος)[12]. This literary activity focused on the figure of Plato is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that Aristotle (who, admittedly, died in exile) was not acclaimed in the same way by the first generations of Peripatetics after his death[13]. Unfortunately only a mere handful of fragments have come down to us from all of those works, which must have constituted a veritable treasure-trove for later biographers of Plato and which no doubt provided an excellent basis for the development of many anecdotes and traditions about him.

Because a number of the surviving F of those works deal with biographical issues, quite a few scholars all too easily apply the epithet "biographers of Plato" to the aforementioned writers; H., too, has persistently been placed in this category on the basis of F 1[14]. This label, however, is inaccurate and too one-sided, in three respects. Firstly, from their titles alone it is already clear that not all of the writings on Plato were strictly biographical: a case in point are the *compendia* of Erastos and Asklepiades, which unquestionably must have contained a lot of (fictitious) anecdotal material and sayings. Secondly, these literary productions were not straightforward biographical accounts: they took the form of eulogies, in which fact was mingled with legend[15]. Thirdly, and most importantly, the few remaining F do not deal merely with biographical elements, but also contain doxographical passages in which certain points of Plato's doctrine are explained at considerable length[16]. Combined with Simplikios' explicit comment that H. in his book on Plato wrote about the latter's teachings (T 3: τὰ δοκοῦντα τῷ Πλάτωνι) it should be clear that, while these works may have contained a substantial biographical component, the latter was supplemented with, or rather, served as an introduction to a survey of the most important elements of Plato's

[11] Cf. *Suda* Φ 418 *s.v.* Φιλόσοφος (= PHILIPPOS OF OPUS F 1 p. 115 TARÁN = T 1 LASSERRE) and the commentary on no. 1011 in the present volume.

[12] Cf. PHILOD. *Hist. Acad.* col. 6,10-12 (= ERASTOS T 1 LASSERRE = ASKLEPIADES T 1 LASSERRE) and see the forthcoming commentary on these works in *FGrHist* IV F.

[13] This dissimilarity was also noted by BRINK (1940: 913).

[14] See, for example, BRINK (1940: 913); BIDEZ (1945: 7); LEISEGANG (1950: 2343); MERLAN (1965: 1272); SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 63); KRÄMER (1983: 122; 130).

[15] This feature is most clearly present in the F of Speusippos, but cf. also the remark by Olympiodoros on the contents of Aristotle's λόγος, cited above, p. 199 + n. 8.

[16] This goes especially for two passages deriving from H. (F 2a-b in the present edition) and for three borrowed from Xenokrates (F 264-266 ISNARDI PARENTE = *FGrHist* 1010 F 1a-c).

philosophical doctrine[17]. Accordingly the label 'biographer' reveals only half the picture in the case, for instance, of Xenokrates and H.: they would seem to have been early predecessors of the likes of Apuleius and Diogenes Laertios who, in their works, also combined biographical and doxographical information (βίος καὶ ἀρέσκοντα) about their subjects[18]. Even more interestingly, this would seem to set the early writers about Plato apart from (the majority of?) Hellenistic biographers in general who—judging by the available evidence—seem to have concentrated solely on the biographical aspect of their subjects, omitting any discussion of doxographical issues[19].

In connection with the bad name which H. had earned himself by selling Plato's dialogues (T 2) and in view of the fact that F 2 concerns points from Plato's unwritten doctrine, a few scholars have interpreted the *passus* in Plato's Seventh Letter (341b-c), which contains a severe denunciation of all those who claim to be able to reproduce Plato's (oral) teachings in writing, as an indictment of H., who not only wrote a special monograph on Plato's life and doctrine, but also a treatise *On the Mathematical Sciences*, which may likewise have included references to Plato's thought[20]. Interesting though this interpretation is, it is nevertheless unlikely because, as has been indicated above, H. was not the only Academic to address these points in a literary work: if one insists on applying the passage from the Seventh Letter to him, one ought to proceed likewise in the case of Speusippos and Xenokrates (among others). All in all it is improbable that the early literary tradition about Plato was subsequently rejected, in its entirety, by the Academy.

---

[17] This more qualified view of the work of H. is also adopted by ZELLER II.1 (1922^5: 389 n. 1); NATORP (1912: 861); SCHMIDT (1967: 1080-1081); ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 437); DÖRRIE – BALTES III (1993: 235-236).

[18] This connection was pointed out by DÖRRIE – BALTES III (1993: 235-236), who also drew attention to a number of late works which foresook the biographical introduction and concentrated exclusively on a discussion of Plato's teachings (for instance, Περὶ τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας in at least eleven books by Derkyllides, Περὶ τῆς Πλάτωνος αἱρέσεως by Galenos of Pergamon, and Περὶ τῶν Πλάτωνι ἀρεσκόντων in three books by Albinos).

[19] It can hardly be coincidence that among the very few F remaining of the early writers on Plato there are several purely doxographical quotations, whereas there exist a mere handful of such passages in the (relatively) large number of texts that have been preserved from Hellenistic biographers such as ANTIGONOS OF KARYSTOS (*FGrHist* IV A 2, 1015), HERMIPPOS OF SMYRNA (*FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026) and SATYROS (*FGrHist* IV A 4, 1033). On the apparant lack of interest of Hellenistic biographers in doxographical issues, see MEJER (1978: 90-93), who erroneously included the early writers on Plato among them and clearly overlooked the two doxographical passages of Hermodoros.

[20] So ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 437-438); DÖRRIE I (1987: 295).

A mere two F (spread over a handful of passages) remain of H.'s monograph on Plato, only one of which is biographical. Since this is not the place to enter into a philosophical discussion on Plato's theory on matter, the interested reader is referred to the specialized literature for a commentary on the doxographical F 2[21]. With regard to the purely biographical part of H.'s work Lasserre[22] has on several occasions attempted to add to the available texts by making H. an important source for Philodemos' *History of the Academy*. Thus Philodemos, it is claimed, derived from H.'s *On Plato* his information regarding Plato's voyages to Syracuse (col. X/Z), his final night (col. 3/5, after Philippos of Opus), his school (col. Y, again after Philippos) and his dialogues (col. 1*-1). Now, it has been rightly stressed that it is quite possible that a number of anecdotes on Plato which are not attested until later, were nevertheless derived from the first-generation writers on the founding father of the Academy[23]. Still, Gaiser[24] has meticulously laid bare the fallacy of Lasserre's *Quellenforschung*, which is based on Mekler's outdated edition of P. Herc. 1021[25].

Since, moreover, no additional text material can, in the present state of affairs, be attributed to H. from the Plato-*vita* of Diogenes[26], we have to make do in the present fascicle with H.'s testimony regarding Plato's stay with Eukleides of Megara.

Commentary on testimonies and fragments

T

(1) This T stems from the list of important pupils of Plato which Philodemos has quoted at the end of the section in his *Historia Academicorum* devoted to the founder of the Academy[27]. Close analysis of the catalogue reveals that it is significantly different from the similar lists

---

[21] See Krämer (1983: 130-131; 148-149), who gives the older bibliography; Isnardi Parente (1982: 439-444); Dörrie I (1987: 296-302); Dörrie – Baltes IV (1996: 485; 524-526). The translations of F 2ab were taken (with modifications) from de Vogel (1949: 205-207).

[22] See Lasserre (1983a: 169-177); Id. (1983b: 63-74); Id. (1987: 217-223; 601-605; 667-680).

[23] So Swift Riginos (1976: 204 n. 12).

[24] See Gaiser (1988: 89-91; 110-115; 439-440; 445).

[25] Mekler's edition (1958^2) has been superseded by the excellent new editions, replete with extensive explanatory notes, by Gaiser (1988) and Dorandi (1991).

[26] See the commentary on F 1, p. 207-209.

[27] Cf. Philod. *Hist. Acad.* col. 5,32-6,20 p. 181-186 Gaiser.

preserved in the works of Diogenes Laertios and Ibn al-Qiftî (which, in turn, would seem to rest on a common source)[28]. Gaiser[29] has provided good grounds for assuming that Philodemos derived his list from the *Lives of the Philosophers* (Βίοι τῶν φιλοσόφων) by Diokles of Magnesia who, for his part, would appear to have taken it from the historiographer Timaios of Tauromenion. The Sicilian origin of the latter might account for the inclusion in Philodemos' list of the Syracusan H., who is noticeably absent from the two other aforementioned catalogues[30].

(2) For an exact understanding of the charges brought against H. in the verse in question the testimony of Cicero (T 2a) is crucial: he reproaches Atticus for having surpassed even H. by publishing some of his writings which he himself had not yet wanted to make public. Accordingly, we may conclude that at least in Cicero's view H. was accused *not* of having divulged tenets of Plato which the master had not yet consented to publish, but of enriching himself by selling the works of Plato which had already received official approval by the master himself, that is, the dialogues[31]. The latter act was already highly unbecoming in a disciple of the school which had made no secret of its abhorrence of commerce and money-making (the βίος χρηματιστικός) and of imparting knowledge for profit[32].

The origin of the caustic verse has been variously sought in contemporary comic drama[33] and in Hellenistic anti-Academic tradition[34]. As a matter of fact both possibilities are perfectly compatible: the catchy phrase could have been thought up by a comic playwright and subsequently picked up by later tradition hostile to the Academy[35]. At any rate the saying became so famous that it acquired proverbial status, which ensured its perpetuation well into the Middle Ages (cf. T 2b-c, deriving from the *Suda* and the *Corpus paroemiographorum*).

---

28 Cf. Diog. Laert. 3,46; Ibn al-Qiftî p. 24,2-8 Lippert. For a comparison of the three lists, see Gaiser (1988: 443-444).

29 Gaiser (1988: 110-115; 443-449 *passim*).

30 So Gaiser (1988: 447).

31 So also Dörrie I (1987: 294-295); Gaiser (1988: 447).

32 Sokrates' dislike of this typically sophistic practice is a recurrent theme in the ancient sources (cf., for instance, Plat. *Prot.* 313c-314e; 317b; *Soph.* 223c-224e; Xen. *Mem.* 1,6.11-14; Diog. Laert. 2,65; 2,80), and the members of the Academy took their cue from him (or, at least, were supposed to do so).

33 Cf. F 269 *adesp.* Kock III = F 937 Kassel – Austin VIII; see Dörrie I (1987: 294); Gaiser (1988: 447).

34 Thus Isnardi Parente (1982: 437).

35 This seems to be suggested by Dörrie I (1987: 294-295), too.

(3a) While it is obvious that Simplikios derived the H.-excerpt from Porphyry and that the latter borrowed it from Derkyllides, we have every reason to believe that H.'s *On Plato* was still available to the author of the treatise *On the Philosophy of Plato*, who lived in the first century A.D.[36]. What happened with the work after that time is anybody's guess, but presumably H. did not make the list of authors whose writings were thought worthy of being transferred from papyrus scroll to codex.

F

(1) H.'s explicit indication that Plato was 28 years old at the time of Sokrates' death suggests that he placed the birth of his master in the year 428/7 B.C., a date which corresponds to that calculated two centuries later by the chronographer Apollodoros of Athens, namely, (the first year of) the eighty-eighth Olympiad (428/7-425/4 B.C.)[37]. More importantly this small piece of information suggests that the notice under discussion was part of a larger exposition built up on a chronological framework and, hence, that H. gave a survey of several events and phases in Plato's life: this is a strong indication that the work *On Plato* actually contained a biographical exposition on the founder of the Academy.

It is an established fact that approximately ten years lie between Sokrates' death (399 B.C.) and Plato's journey to Sicily and southern Italy (dated to c. 390-388 B.C.), a period about which Plato himself remains completely silent. Hence we are fortunate that his retreat ("together with several other 'Socratics' ") to Eukleides of Megara, in the aftermath of the tragic death of his dear friend and teacher, is vouched for by the excellent authority of Plato's direct pupil H. Even though the latter is the only authority for this particular point[38], there

---

[36] This is also the view of DÖRRIE – BALTES III (1993: 236).

[37] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 3,2 = APOLLODOROS 244 F 37. On the issue of Plato's date of birth, see GUTHRIE IV (1975: 10 + n. 2).

[38] A few other passages also imply or refer to a visit to Eukleides by some pupils of Sokrates immediately after the latter's execution: cf. the Socratic epistles 15, 21 and 22, as well as DIOG. LAERT. 2,62 and IOH. CHRYS. *Laud. S. Pauli* 4,19 PIÉDAGNEL; sadly, none of the latter contain a reference to a source. There may also be a veiled reminiscence of the episode in PLAT. *Ep.* 7,329a.

is no ground for assuming with Gigon[39] that this piece of information is suspect and that the withdrawal to Megara was invented, in typical ancient biographical fashion[40], on the basis of an aspect of Plato's teachings or writings which might lead one to postulate direct discipleship of the latter with Eukleides[41]. As Döring[42] rightly pointed out, the inventions of Plato's pupils seem to have sprung primarily from their intention to glorify their master and turn him into a hero[43], and this is hardly the case here. Moreover, Megara was not far removed from Athens (some 30-40 km) and Eukleides had, like Plato, been a member of the inner Socratic circle, as can be gathered from the fact that he, together with his friend Terpsion, had been among those present in Sokrates' final hour[44]. Hence there is no reason to suppose that the visit did not actually take place, and the vast majority of modern scholars are prepared to believe it did[45].

---

[39] See GIGON (1946: 100-101) and ID. (1979²: 34; 283-284). Apart from Gigon, GIANNANTONI IV (1990: 36 + n. 18) is the only other scholar who has rejected the historicity of the episode. It should be noted that the Italian scholar gives a wholly misleading survey of modern literature on the subject, suggesting that most scholars question the accuracy of Hermodoros' account in its entirety; as will be shown below, this suspicion only concerns the motive which is given in the F under discussion for the move to Megara, *not* the fact that some Socratics, including Plato, really did stay with Eukleides.

[40] It is well known that a popular method adopted by ancient biographers of literary men and philosophers in order to obtain material for their writings, was to invent stories and anecdotes on the basis of elements contained in their subjects' written works or known doctrines. On this practice, which will be abundantly illustrated in the forthcoming commentaries on HERMIPPOS OF SMYRNA (*FGrHist* IV A 3, 1026 F 64, 66, 83) and SATYROS (*FGrHist* IV A 4, 1033; cf. P.Oxy. 9, 1176 fr. 39 col. II; IX; X-XII; XVI,17-29 = F 19 KUMANIECKI) as well as on CHAMAILEON OF HERAKLEIA (*FGrHist* IV B; cf. F 25, 40 WEHRLI IX = F 24, 40 GIORDANO), see FAIRWEATHER (1974: 231-242); LEFKOWITZ (1981 *passim*); ARRIGHETTI (1987: 139-148).

[41] As will be argued below (p. 206-207) the F under discussion need not originally have been intended to suggest that Plato went to Megara with the express purpose of studying under Eukleides. On the other hand, it is theoretically possible (but the question is purely academic!) that the episode was invented on the basis of PLAT. *Crit.* 53a and *Phaed.* 99a, where Megara and Thebes are mentioned as possible havens of refuge for Sokrates.

[42] See DÖRING (1972: 76-77).

[43] This is most notably the case in the remaining F of Speusippos' Περίδειπνον (see the commentary in the present volume on 1009 F 1-3).

[44] Cf. PLAT. *Phaed.* 59b-c; SOCR. *Ep.* 14,8-9 (= I 1 A 3a-b DÖRING = II A 4 GIANNANTONI I).

[45] Apart from Gigon and Giannantoni modern scholarship has indeed had no difficulty in accepting the historicity of the withdrawal: see, for instance, U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF I (1959²: 136); HOFFMANN (1961: 105-113); CHROUST (1957: 191); DÖRING (1972: 76-77); GUTHRIE III (1969: 499) and IV (1975: 14); SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 63); MULLER (1985: 96).

Having said that, the ground which is adduced in F 1a (and c) for the trip to Megara—"dreading the tyrants' cruelty"—has been greeted with much more scepticism by modern scholarship. To be sure, it has long been clear that the designation 'tyrants' should not be taken to be a reference to the regime of the thirty oligarchs, but could well apply, from the Socratics' point of view, to the leaders of the restored democracy who had put the revered philosopher to death[46]. However, it is hardly credible that even the closest of Sokrates' followers put their lives at risk by staying around in Athens after his execution[47]. Most likely the motive was invented *post factum* around the historical kernel, namely, the withdrawal to Eukleides: it certainly corresponds well with the Academics' known and open dislike of the democratic regime (or, for that matter, of any other then existing form of rule)[48] and can be seen as a final swipe at those who perpetrated the grave injustice of killing Sokrates. Whether H. already thought this up, or whether it was added to his story at a later stage in the tradition, we do not know, but the former possibility cannot to be ruled out[49].

As to why Plato and some other pupils of Sokrates really left Athens for Megara, it should be borne in mind that it must have been a relief to the grieving Socratics to be able to escape from Athens, a place so full of fond memories, to a neighbouring city where they could find like-minded spirits and where they could continue their lively philosophical debates in a congenial atmosphere[50]. We have no

---

[46] See ZELLER II.1 (1922^5: 402 n. 2 on 402-404): "ein τύραννος ist nach griechischer Anschauung der Einzelne, welcher gesetzwidrig herrscht, eine Regierung, wie die der Dreissig, ist keine Tyrannis, sondern, wie sie auch immer genannt wird (*sc.* in the ancient sources), eine Oligarchie (...) ich sehe keinen Grund ein, warum gewaltthätige Demokraten nicht gerade so gut, wie gewaltthätige Oligarchen, von einem Gegner τύραννοι genannt werden konnten."

[47] See U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF I (1959^2: 136); ZELLER II.1 (1922^5: 402 n. 2 on 403-404); HOFFMANN (1961: 105-106); DÖRING (1972: 76-77). GUTHRIE IV (1975: 14) and MULLER (1985: 96) suspend judgement on this issue, and the only scholar to accept that political motives may have prompted the departure from Athens is CHROUST (1957: 191).

[48] Cf. PLAT. *Resp.* 5,473c-d; *Ep.* 7,324b-326b.

[49] See ZELLER II.1 (1922^5: 402 n. 2 on 403-404); DÖRING (1972: 76).
That the motivation given for the retreat to Eukleides was something of a stock motif might be inferred from the interesting parallel case of Aristotle, who is said to have fled from Athens in the final years of his life lest he should suffer Sokrates' fate (cf. ARISTOTLE T 44A-E; 45A-D DÜRING).

[50] On possible grounds for Plato's stay in Megara, see HOFFMANN (1961: 105-113); GUTHRIE IV (1975: 14). It is conceivable that Plato, who himself was absent during Sokrates' final hours in prison (cf. *Phaed.* 59b), gathered much of his material for the *Phaedo* during his stay with Eukleides and Terpsion in Megara: see TAYLOR (1926: 176). That Plato and Eukleides [who were age peers: see DÖRING (1972: 73-74)] were

sure evidence about about the duration of the sojourn with Eukleides. Only a vague clue is provided by the fact that, according to Aristoxenos, Plato was actively involved in the foreign campaigns of the Athenian army during the Corinthian war: this would mean that he had returned to Athens by the outbreak of hostilities in 395 B.C.[51].

If the reason given in the *passus* under discussion for Plato's 'escape' to Eukleides goes back to H., this would seem to preclude the assumption, made by Isnardi Parente[52], that in its original setting the present F was not purely biographical in purport, but touched on the history of Plato's philosophical training as well, by asserting that he became a pupil of Eukleides. It is, furthermore, not even an established fact that the latter had already founded his 'Megarian school' by the time of Sokrates' death; for all we know the impetus for this undertaking may have been provided by the very fact that a number of fellow-philosophers had gathered around him in his home town[53]. More importantly, the context in which the present F is quoted by Diogenes Laertios—it is embedded in the section of the Plato-*vita* (3,6-7) devoted to the various traditions about study journeys allegedly undertaken before the establishment of a new philosophical school in the *Akademeia*-gymnasium—does not necessarily correspond to that in the original work of H.

We are also unable to connect H.'s name with any of the other statements reported by Diogenes concerning the educational trips of Plato[54]. Actually the specific reference in two places by the Laertian to H. regarding Plato's stay with Eukleides clearly indicates that his

---

well acquainted with one another is commonly accepted: see MULLER (1985: 96 + n. 47). It may also be noted that Eukleides and Terpsion still appear together in the conversation which serves as the prologue to the *Theaetetus* (142a-143c).

[51] For Aristoxenos' report—the only other piece of information we have for the ten-year period in Plato's life between Sokrates' death and the first Sicilian journey—, cf. DIOG. LAERT. 3,8 (= F 61 WEHRLI II). This passage, admittedly, appears to suffer from confusion over campaigns undertaken by Sokrates and Plato, but it is not certain that the Tarentine biographer was himself responsible for this, nor does this observation suffice to raise doubts about Plato's involvement in the Corinthian war: see Wehrli's commentary *ad loc.* (1967[2]: 67), as well as BRISSON (1992: 3644-3645).

[52] ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 437-438).

[53] This is also the view of GIANNANTONI IV (1990: 36), against MULLER (1985: 96), who tends to lend too much weight to Plato's stay in Megara, considering it as a major step in the latter's development as a thinker and writer.
No less than three comprehensive collections of *testimonia* and fragments with commentary have been published over the last few decades in regard to Eukleides and the Megarian School: see DÖRING (1972); MULLER (1985); GIANNANTONI I (1990: 375-483) and IV (1990: 33-39; 41-50; 51-60; 61-71).

[54] *Pace* HUFFMAN (1993: 5 + n. 4).

name was firmly connected with that particular piece of information and should not necessarily be combined with any other detail. Besides it can easily be demonstrated that the entire passage F 1b has been culled from, is a patchwork of several different sources. By introducing the H.-quote with εἶτα Diogenes links it closely to the immediately preceding statement that after Sokrates' death Plato attached himself to Kratylos the Heraclitean and Hermogenes a Parmenidean. However, since H. obviously situated Plato's retreat to Eukleides in the direct aftermath of Sokrates' execution[55], it is simply unthinkable that he had anything to do with the information (which Diogenes reports on no express authority and which may altogether be spurious[56]) that Plato became a disciple of the said Kratylos and Hermogenes. Accordingly, the seemingly coherent chronological sequence of events projected by Diogenes is shattered—but then again, this is not the only instance where he has put together different pieces of information gathered from various sources in a deplorably clumsy way[57].

While H. in his biographical survey indubitably mentioned Plato's first voyage to Sicily[58] it is, moreover, anything but certain that he was aware of or described journeys by his master to other (mainly oriental) parts of the then civilized world. Indeed, scholars are nowadays highly suspicious of this tradition, not least because the earliest authority for it is Cicero[59], whereas the latter's contemporary Philodemos, who relied heavily on Hellenistic sources, apparently only mentioned the trip to the Pythagoreans in *Magna Graecia*[60]; combined with the fact that in ancient biographical tradition on philosophers in general, sojourns in Egypt and contacts with the Persian *Magoi* were mandatory elements of the *curriculum vitae*, this could be taken to mean that the additional trips (even those to Egypt and Kyrene) belong to the realm of myth and are secondary inventions which entered an-

---

55 So much can be inferred from the reference (invented or not) to the Socratics' fear of the democratic government, and also from the statement that Plato was twenty-eight at the time of the withdrawal to Megara, which coincides with the year of Sokrates' death.

56 See Brisson (1992: 3639-3640).

57 On the occurrence of 'Zitatennesten' in Diogenes' work (e.g. 2,38-39; 8,67-74), see Mejer (1978: 18; 19-22).

58 As already suggested above (p. 198), they presumably became acquainted in the course of the trip.

59 Cf. Cic. *Resp.* 1,10.16; *Fin.* 5,29.87.

60 Cf. Philod. *Hist. Acad.* col. X 5-9 p. 165 Gaiser.

cient biographical tradition on Plato well after H.'s time[61]. Consequently there are no grounds for attributing any more of the text from Diogenes' section on Plato's travels (3,6-7) to him.

Jan Bollansée

Text editions and translations

*A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* III (Lexicographi Graeci 1), Leipzig 1933 (= Stuttgart 1967).

*J. Beaujeu, Cicéron, *Correspondance* VIII (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1983.

*H. Diels, Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 9), Berlin 1882.

T. Dorandi, Filodemo, *Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l'Academia (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Epicuro 12), Napoli 1991.

K. Döring, *Die Megariker. Kommentierte Sammlung der Testimonien* (Studien zur antiken Philosophie 2), Amsterdam 1972.

H. Dörrie, *Die geschichtlichen Wurzeln des Platonismus. Bausteine 1-35: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von A. Dörrie* (Der Platonismus in der Antike 1), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1987.

H. Dörrie, *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus. Bausteine 36-72: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben und bearbeitet von M. Baltes unter Mitarbeit von A. Dörrie und F. Mann* (Der Platonismus in der Antike 2), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1990.

H. Dörrie – M. Baltes, *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus. Bausteine 73-100: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Der Platonismus in der Antike 3), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1993.

H. Dörrie – M. Baltes, *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus. Eine grundlegende Axiome/Platonische Physik (im antiken Verständnis)*, I. *Bausteine 101-124: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Der Platonismus in der Antike 4), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1996.

I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 5), Göteborg 1957.

*I. Flach, *Hesychii Milesii qui fertur de viris illustribus liber* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1880.

---

[61] While scholars find the idea of Plato travelling to Egypt and nearby Kyrene at least plausible, trips to the Phoenicians and the Persian *Magoi* are generally dismissed as *topoi* of philosophers' *vitae*. It is impossible to provide here a complete survey of all ancient passages relating to Plato's philosophical training and travels, and of every scholar who has expressed an opinion on the matter; the interested reader is referred to Dörrie (1973: 99-118); Swift Riginos (1976: 61-85); Gaiser (1988: 397-399); Dörrie II (1990: 166-218; 425-505) and Brisson (1992: 3637-3643).

K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri* (Supplementum Platonicum 1), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1988.
G. Giannantoni, *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae*, 4 vol. (Elenchos 18), Napoli 1990.
M. Isnardi Parente, *Senocrate-Ermodoro, Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Platone 3), Napoli 1982.
M. Isnardi Parente, *Addendum a Ermodoro*, in *PP* 42 (1987), p. 292-294.
F. Lasserre, *De Léodamas de Thasos à Philippe d'Oponte. Témoignages et fragments. Edition, traduction et commentaire* (La scuola di Platone 2), Napoli 1987.
F. Lasserre, *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Texte und Kommentare. Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 4), Berlin 1966.
*E.L. Leutsch – F.G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, 2 vol., Göttingen 1839 -1851 (= Hildesheim 1965).
*H.S. Long, Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, 2 vol. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964.
S. Mekler, *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculanensis*, Berlin 1958^2.
R. Muller, *Les Mégariques. Fragments et témoignages* (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique 9), Paris 1985.
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, II. *Aristoxenos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1967^2.

Secondary literature

G. Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi e biografici. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.
J. Bidez, *Eos ou Platon et l'Orient*, Bruxelles 1945.
K.O. Brink, art. *Peripatos*, in *RE*, Suppl. 7 (1940), col. 899-949.
L. Brisson, *Diogène Laërce, 'Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres', Livre III: Structure et contenu*, in W. Haase (ed.), *ANRW* II 36,5, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 3619-3760.
A.-H. Chroust, *The Influence of Zoroastrian Teachings on Plato, Aristotle, and Greek Philosophy in General*, in *The New Scholasticism* 54 (1980), p. 342-357.
A.-H. Chroust, *Socrates. Man and Myth*, London - South Bend (Ind.) 1957.
C.J. De Vogel, *Problems Concerning Later Platonism, I-II*, in *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 4,2 (1949), p. 197-216; 299-318.
H. Dörrie, *Platons Reisen zu fernen Völkern. Zur Geschichte eines Motivs der Platon-Legende und zu seiner Neuwendung durch Lactanz*, in W. den Boer – P.G. van der Nat et Al. (ed.), *Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia Iano Henrico Waszink A.D. VI Kal. Nov. A. MCMLXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata*, Amsterdam - London 1973, p. 99-118.
J.A. Fairweather, *Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers*, in *AncSoc* 5 (1974), p. 231-275.
O. Gigon, *Sokrates. Sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*, Bern 1979^2.
O. Gigon, *Studien zu Platons Protagoras*, in O. Gigon – K. Meuli et Al., *Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühll zum 60. Geburtstag am 1. August 1945*, Basel 1946, p. 91-152.

W.K.C. GUTHRIE, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 3. *The Fifth-century Enlightenment*, Cambridge 1969.
W.K.C. GUTHRIE, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 4. *Plato, The Man and his Dialogues: Earlier Period*, Cambridge - London - New York - Melbourne 1975.
E. HOFFMANN, *Platon. Eine Einführung in sein Philosophieren*, Hamburg 1961.
C.A. HUFFMAN, *Philolaus of Croton, Pythagorean and Presocratic. A Commentary on the Fragments and Testimonia with Interpretative Essays*, Cambridge 1993.
W. JAEGER, *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Dublin - Zürich 1955² (= 1967).
W. JAEGER, *Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of his Development. Translated by R. ROBINSON*, Oxford 1948² (= 1968).
P. KINGSLEY, *Meetings with Magi: Iranian Themes among the Greeks, from Xanthus of Lydia to Plato's Academy*, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Ser. 3,5 (1995), p. 173-209.
W.J.W. KOSTER, *Le mythe de Platon, de Zarathoustra et des Chaldéens. Etude critique sur les relations intellectuelles entre Platon et l'Orient*, Leiden 1951.
H.J. KRÄMER, *Die Ältere Akademie*, in H. FLASHAR (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, 3. *Ältere Akademie. Aristoteles-Peripatos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1983, p. 1-174.
F. LASSERRE, *Le Barbare, le Grec et la Science selon Philippe d'Oponte*, in *MH* 40 (1983), p. 169-177 (= 1983a).
F. LASSERRE, *Hermodore de Syracuse dans PHerc 1021 et 164?*, in *CErc* 13 (1983), p. 63-74 (= 1983b).
M.R. LEFKOWITZ, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, Baltimore 1981.
H. LEISEGANG, art. *Platon* (1), in *RE* 20,2 (1950), col. 2342-2537.
P. MERLAN, art. *Hermodoros* (1), in *LAW* (1965), col. 1272.
P. NATORP, art. *Hermodoros* (5), in *RE* 8,1 (1912), col. 861.
E.G. SCHMIDT, art. *Hermodoros* (2), in *DKP* 2 (1967), col. 1080-1081.
E. SPÖRRI, *Encore Platon et L'Orient*, in *RPh* 31 (1957), p. 209-233.
A. SWIFT RIGINOS, *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden 1976.
A.E. TAYLOR, *Plato. The Man and his Work*, London 1926 (= 1977).
W. VAN DER WIELEN, *De ideegetallen van Plato*, diss. Amsterdam 1941.
U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Platon*, I. *Sein Leben und seine Werke. Bearbeitet und mit einem Nachwort versehen von B. SNELL*, Berlin 1959².
E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, II 1. *Sokrates und die Sokratiker. Plato und die alte Akademie. Im Anhang Der gegenwärtige Stand der Platonforschung von E. HOFFMANN*, Leipzig 1922⁵ (= Darmstadt 1963).
E. ZELLER – R. MONDOLFO, *La filosofia dei Greci nel suo sviluppo storico*, Parte II. *Da Socrate ad Aristotele*, Volume 3.2. *Platone (Tomo secondo) e l'Accademia antica. A cura di M. ISNARDI PARENTE*, Firenze 1974.

1009. Speusippos of Athens
(*c*. 410/08–339 B.C.)

T

1 (F 2 ISNARDI PARENTE = T 1 TARÁN) DIOG. LAERT. 4,1: Διεδέξατο δ' αὐτὸν (*sc.* τὸν Πλάτωνα) Σπεύσιππος Εὐρυμέδοντος Ἀθηναῖος, τῶν μὲν δήμων Μυρρινούσιος, υἱὸς δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Πωτώνης. Καὶ ἐσχολάρχησεν ἔτη ὀκτώ, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς ὀγδόης καὶ ἑκατοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος.

2 (T a.1 LANG = F 2 ISNARDI PARENTE = T 1 TARÁN) DIOG. LAERT. 4,4-5: Καταλέλοιπε δὲ (*sc.* ὁ Σπεύσιππος) πάμπλειστα ὑπομνήματα καὶ διαλόγους πλείονας, ἐν οἷς καὶ (...), Περὶ φιλοσοφίας α̅ (...), Φιλόσοφος α̅ (...), Πρὸς Γρύλλον α̅, (5) (...) Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον (...).

3a (F 153 ISNARDI PARENTE) P. HERC. 164, F 12 p. 178 DORANDI: [ὁ Κυζικηνὸς | Τιμό]λαος, Καλλ̣ιγένη̣[ς, | ῾Αθ]η̣ναῖος Τ[ι]μόλαος, | [ὡς] ἐν τῶι [Περι]δείπνωι | [Πλάτωνος ἱ]στορεῖ Σπεύ|[σιππος, Ἀρχύ]τας Ταραν| [τῖνος, (…). **3b** (F 1 ISNARDI PARENTE = no. 1 T 2 LASSERRE) P. HERC. 1021, col. VI, l. 1a-15 p. 135 DORANDI:` [1a][ὁ Κυζικη]νὸς Τιμόλα|[2a]ος, Καλλι|[3a]γέ|[4a]νης, |[5a]῾Αθη|[6a]ναῖος |[7a]Τιμό|[8a]λ̣α̣ς, οὓς |[9a]ἐν τῶι |[10a]Περι| [11a]δ̣είπ̣ν̣ω̣ι |[12a][Πλά]τ̣ω̣ν[ος],´ Ἀρχύτας |[13]Ταραν[τῖνος, (…). **3c** P. HERC. 1005, F 111 p. 166 ANGELI: “ [ ] τὸ περ]ὶ̣ [Σω]κράτ[ους | τοῦ Ἀρ]ι̣σ̣τί̣π̣που̣ (F IV A 147 GIANNANTONI) [κ]αὶ̣ Σπευ̣|[σίππου το]ῦ̣ Πλάτωνος | [ἐγκώμιον] καὶ Ἀριστοτέ|[10][λους τὰ] Ἀναλυτικὰ καὶ | [τὰ Περὶ] φύσεως, ὅσαπερ | ἐ[νεκρίν]ο̣μεν.” (...).

---

7 φιλοσοφίας : *an* φιλοσόφων *scribendum? Cf. Diog. Laert. 9,23* **8** Γρύλλον *fr* : γύλαον *B* : γῦλον *F* : γύλλον *P* **10** Καλλ̣ιγένη̣[ς : [καὶ] Δ̣ι̣ο̣γένη̣[ς? *Mekler* **10** ὁ Ἀθ]ηναῖος *vel* ῾Αθ]ηναῖος *Gaiser* : Ἀθ]ηναῖος *Mekler et Crönert* **10-11** Τ[ι]μόλαος, [ὡς] ἐν τῶι [Περι]δείπνωι [Πλάτωνος ἱ]στορεῖ Σπεύ[σιππος *Gaiser* : [ὅ?] Τ̣ι[μ]όλαος ἐν τῶι [Περι]δείπνωι [ἁπλῶς? ἱσ]τορεῖ, Σπευ[σίππου *Mekler* : [Τι]μ̣όλαος, [τοὺ]ς ἐν τῶι Π̣[ερι]δείπνωι [ἑστιάσας, ὡς ἱ]στορεῖ Σπεύ[σιππος *Crönert* **11** Ἀρχύ]τας Ταραν[τῖνος *Crönert et Gaiser* : πάν]τα ἐ̣ξ̣ά̣ραν[τος] *Mekler* **14** ῾Αθηναῖος *Gaiser* : Ἀθηναῖος *Mekler-Crönert-Lasserre* **14-15** Τιμό[λ]ας, οὓς ἐν τῶι Περιδ̣είπ̣ν̣ω̣ι [Πλά]τ̣ω̣ν[ος] *Gaiser* : [ὁ] Τιμ̣ο̣λάῳ̣ι ἐν τῶι περιδ̣είπ̣ν̣ῳ̣ι [συ]ντα[ξάμε]νος *Mekler* : Τιμόλ̣α̣ς, τοὺς ἐν τῶι Περιδείπ̣ν[ω]ι [ἑστιάσας, *Crönert* **16** (...) τὸ περ]ὶ̣ [Σω]κράτ[ους *Angeli* : καὶ Πλάτωνος τὴν Ἀπολογίαν τ]ο̣ῦ̣ Σ̣ω̣κράτ[ους *Crönert et Diano* : εἶναι] πισ[τ]ὸ̣[ν] Κράτη[τ]ο̣ς *Sbordone et Arrighetti* **16** τοῦ *Angeli* : καὶ *Crönert et alii* **17** [κ]αὶ̣ Σπευ̣[σίππου το]ῦ̣ *Angeli* : τ̣ὰ̣ς πε[ρὶ τινων το]ῦ̣ *Crönert et alii* **17** [ἐγκώμιον] *Angeli* : διατριβ]ὰ̣[ς *Crönert et alii*

1009. Speusippos of Athens

(*c*. 410/08–339 B.C.)

T

1 Speusippos, son of Eurymedon, an Athenian, who belonged to the deme of Myrrhinus and who was the son of Plato's sister Potone, succeeded him (*sc*. Plato). He was head of the school for eight years, beginning in the 108th Olympiad.

2 He has left behind a vast store of research memoranda and numerous dialogues, including (...) *On Philosophy,* one book; (...) *The Philosopher,* one book; (...) *(In Reply) To Gryllos*, one book; (5) (...) *Eulogy of Plato* ; (...).

3a Timolaos of Kyzikos, Kalligenes, Timolaos of Athens, as Speusippos relates in the *Funeral Banquet of Plato*, Archytas of Taras, (…). **3b** Timolaos of Kyzikos, Kalligenes, Timolas [*sic*] of Athens, who (are mentioned) in (Speusippos') *Funeral Banquet of Plato*, Archytas of Taras, (…). **3c** "... the work *On Sokrates* by Aristippos and Speusippos' *Eulogy of Plato* and Aristotle's *Analytics* and his books *On Nature*, the very ones that we have chosen". (...)

4 (F 1 Lang = F 118 Isnardi Parente = F 3 Tarán) Diog. Laert. 9,23: (...), ὥς φησι Σπεύσιππος ἐν τῷ Περὶ φιλοσόφων (cf. F 4).

F

1. ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ (= ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΕΓΚΩΜΙΟΝ [?])

1a (F 27 Lang = F 147 Isnardi Parente = F 1a Tarán = Plato Baustein 58.1 Dörrie) Diog. Laert. 3,2 : Σπεύσιππος δ' ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Πλάτωνος περιδείπνῳ καὶ Κλέαρχος (*FGrHist* 1021; *FHG* II, p. 316, F 43; F 2a Wehrli III) ἐν τῷ Πλάτωνος ἐγκωμίῳ καὶ Ἀναξιλίδης (*FGrHist* IV A 6) ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ Περὶ φιλοσόφων φασὶν ὡς Ἀθήνησιν ἦν λόγος ὡραίαν οὖσαν τὴν Περικτιόνην βιάζεσθαι τὸν Ἀρίστωνα καὶ μὴ τυγχάνειν· Παυόμενόν τε τῆς βίας ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὄψιν· Ὅθεν καθαρὰν γάμου φυλάξαι ἕως τῆς ἀποκυήσεως. **1b** (F 27 Lang = F 148 Isnardi Parente = F 1b Tarán = Plato Baustein 58.7 Dörrie) Hier. *Adv. Iovin.* 1,42: Speusippus quoque sororis Platonis filius et Clearcus (*FGrHist* 1021 = *FHG* II, p. 316, F 43 = F 2b Wehrli III) in Laude Platonis et Anaxilides (*FGrHist* IV A 6) in secundo libro Philosophiae Perictionem, matrem Platonis, fasmate Apollinis oppressam ferunt, et sapientiae principem non aliter arbitrantur nisi de partu virginis editum.

2 (F 28 Lang = F 151 Isnardi Parente = F 2 Tarán = Plato Baustein 58.4 Dörrie) Apul. *Plat.* 1,2: Talis igitur ac de talibus Plato non solum heroum virtutibus praestitit, verum etiam aequiperavit divum potestatibus. Nam Speusippus domesticis documentis instructus, et pueri eius acre in percipiendo ingenium et admirandae verecundiae indolem laudat et pubescentis primitias labore atque amore studendi imbutas refert et in viro harum incrementa virtutum et ceterarum convenisse testatur.

---

21 ὥς (…) Περὶ φιλοσόφων *om. F* **25** Ἀναξιλίδης *FPp.corr. (cf. Hier. Adv. Iovin. 1,42)* : Ἀναξιλήδης *B* : Ἀναξιάδης *Pa.corr.* : Ἀναξιλαΐδης *Cobet* : Ἀναξιλείδης *Lang* **26** ὡς *BF* : *om. P* **26** ἦν *FP* : *om. B* **27** τυγχάνειν : ἐπιτυγχάνειν *F (επι scrips.* m^2*)* **32** Anaxilides *AC* : Amaxilides *ESς* **33** fasmate : fasmatae *ES* : phantasmate (fant. *A*) *ςAC* **33** Apollinis *Sς* : Appolinis *EAC* **35** partu : partum *ES* **35** virginis : virgis *ς* **39** acre *RCPb Ioh. Colv.* : aere *cett. codd.* **39** in percipiendo *Ioh. Sarisb. Colv.* : in perciendo *codd.* : in aere partiendo *Rom.* **40** pubescentis : pubescentes B^3*MV Ioh. Sarisb.*

4 (...), as Speusippos writes in his book *On Philosophers*.

F

1. PLATO'S FUNERAL BANQUET (= EULOGY OF PLATO [?])

1a Speusippos in his work entitled *Plato's Funeral Banquet*, Klearchos in his *Eulogy of Plato*, and Anaxilides in the second book of his work *On Philosophers*, relate that there was a rumour in Athens that Ariston tried to violate Periktione, then in the bloom of youth, but failed; and that, when he ceased the violence, he saw a vision of Apollo; from that moment on he did not consummate the marriage until she had borne (her child). **1b** Speusippos too, the son of Plato's sister, and Klearchos in his *Eulogy of Plato*, and Anaxilides in the second book of his work entitled *Philosophy* say that Periktione, the mother of Plato, was overpowered by an apparition of Apollo, and they believe that the prince of wisdom was born in no way other than by birth from a virgin.

2 With such a background and from such origin, Plato not only surpassed the virtues of heroes, but he even equalled the powers of gods. Indeed, Speusippos, informed by family tradition, praises this child's inborn acumen and the innate quality of his admirable modesty, and tells about the first steps of his adolescence, imbued with diligence and love for study, and he testifies that when he was an adult man these virtues even increased and combined with others.

3 P. Herc. 1021, col. V, additamentum II p. 180 Gaiser :—ἠβούλετο Νεάνθης. | Οἱ δὲ τἀδελφιδο[ῦ̣] (*sc.* τοῦ Σπευσίππου) εἰσ| [φέρου]σ̣ι[ν π]ά̣λ̣ιν, [ὡς ἐν τῶι] | [ὑπ]ν̣ο̣ῦ̣σ̣θαι ν[ύκτωρ τὴν] | [ψυχ]ὴ̣ν ἀφί[ει] (*sc.* ὁ Πλάτων).

2. ΠΕΡΙ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩΝ (= ΠΕΡΙ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ / ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΣ [?])

4 (F 1 Lang = F 118 Isnardi Parente = F 3 Tarán) Diog. Laert. 9,23: Λέγεται δὲ (*sc.* ὁ Παρμενίδης; F 28[18].A.1 Diels – Kranz = F 287 Kirk – Raven – Schofield = F 1 Untersteiner) καὶ νόμους θεῖναι τοῖς πολίταις, ὥς φησι Σπεύσιππος ἐν τῷ Περὶ φιλοσόφων.

---

44 οἱ δὲ τἀδελφιδο[ῦ̣] *Gaiser* : Ṇ̣ΙΔΕΤΑΔΕΛΦΙΔΩΕΙΟ *Crönert* : ΟΙΔΕΠΑΔΕΛΦΙΔ[*Mekler* : Ọ̣ΙΔΕΤΑΔΕΛΦΙΔ[*Dorandi* **49** ὥς (…) Περὶ φιλοσόφων *om. F*

3 This is how Neanthes wanted it. Others again relate the nephew's (*sc.* Speusippos') version: that he (*sc.* Plato) gave up his soul during the night while sleeping.

2. ON PHILOSOPHERS (= ON PHILOSOPHY / THE PHILOSOPHER [?])

4 He (*sc.* Parmenides) is also said to have given laws to his fellow citizens, as Speusippos writes in his book *On Philosophers*.

1009. Speusippos of Athens

(*c.* 410/08–339 B.C.)

T

(1) This testimonium informs us of the close relations between S., Plato and the Academy, which enabled S. to know a great deal about Plato's personal life.

To begin with, S. was the son of Plato's sister Potone[1]. From his mother and other close relatives S. had undoubtedly heard a lot of stories about his uncle's younger years[2]. For Plato's later life, S. could also rely on his own experience, as he was a student in his uncle's school. After Plato's death in 348/7 B.C., S. succeeded him as head of the Academy[3], probably upon the instructions of Plato himself[4]. S.'s

---

[1] On the dates of S.'s birth and death, see most recently ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 208-209) and TARÁN (1981: 7).

[2] Cf. the comm. on F 2.

[3] Diogenes' information about S.'s scholarchate starting in the 108th Olympiad (*i.e.* 348-344 B.C.) comes from Apollodoros (*FGrHist* 244 F 344a). In P. OXY. 12, col. I, l. 16-24 (= *FGrHist* 255 F 3) it is specified that Plato died and was succeeded by S. in the first year of that Olympiad. For other references to the date of Plato's death, see TARÁN (1981: 176).

[4] See P. HERC. 1021, col. VI, l. 28-30 (= *FGrHist* 328 F 224 = F 1 ISNARDI PARENTE = T 2 TARÁN): Σπε[ύσιππος] μ̣ὲ̣ν οὖν πα[ρ' α]ὐτοῦ `[Πλ]άτων[ος νο]σ̣ῶν´ διεδέ[ξ]α̣το τὴν δ[ιατριβὴ]ν. This expression seems to indicate that S. was appointed by Plato himself and not by election: cf. TARÁN (1981: 10-11); GAISER (1988: 459); DORANDI (1991: 226). For the question why it was S. who succeeded Plato, rather than Aristotle (or Xenokrates), see e.g. CHROUST (1971: 338-341); TARÁN (1981: 8-11) and WHITEHEAD (1981: 225-232), all with references to previous literature. According to Chroust, Plato was obliged under Athenian law, "which didn't recognize the legal fiction of the corporate personality", to bequeath the school property to his nearest agnatic male relative, being his nephew S. This assertion was convincingly refuted by TARÁN (1981: 9; 11) and WHITEHEAD (1981: 227-230). If Plato's will quoted by DIOG. LAERT. 3,41-43 is genuine, Adeimantos—probably the grandson of his eldest brother—was Plato's heir, whereas S. was only the second trustee. Moreover we know that in 339 B.C. S. himself was succeeded by Xenokrates, who was not a relative and not even an Athenian citizen. Legal problems do not seem to have played a role in Plato's choice of S. as his successor. What did determine his decision remains a matter of conjecture. However, the contention—held by some scholars even today—that S. owed his scholarchate only to his family ties with Plato, seems to have its origin in a tradition hostile to S. or Plato and does not necessarily correspond to historical fact; cf. ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 206) and TARÁN (1981: 203). On the superscript above διεδέ[ξ]α̣το in P. HERC. 1021, col. VI, l. 29, which Mekler emended to ἅτ' ὢν [Πο]τ̣ών[ης υἱός and which was taken by many as evidence for Plato's nepotism, see most recently GAISER (1988: 459) and DORANDI (1991: 226).

scholarchate lasted for a period of eight years[5] and was ended only by the philosopher's death in 340/39[6].

(2) Diogenes Laertios' catalogue of S.'s writings (T 2) is a "most unsatisfactory document"[7], which raises all sorts of problems in terms of interpretation[8]. It is incomplete, lacks proper classification, and some titles seem to appear twice under a slightly different form. Bywater and Merlan assume that Diogenes composed his catalogue from two distinct lists and that he repeated some titles when they were not literally the same[9]. If these authors are right, this would prove that the titles enumerated on these lists—which seem to originate from the catalogues of Hellenistic libraries—are not always the 'original' titles and that they should not necessarily be preferred to those cited by later authors[10].

Some titles in Diogenes' catalogue may indicate works which demonstrate a certain biographical interest:

(1) The *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* and the *Φιλόσοφος*. One of these works is possibly identical with the *Περὶ φιλοσόφων*, cited by DIOG. LAERT. 9,23 (T 4 and F 4). See the commentary on F 4.

(2) The *Πρὸς Γρύλλον*, which might have been an eulogy of Gryllos[11], the son of Xenophon, who died in the battle of Mantineia in 362 B.C. According to Aristotle (*ap.* DIOG. LAERT. 2,55) many authors wrote an ἐγκώμιον in his honour.

---

5 Cf. P. HERC. 1021, col. VI, l. 39-40.

6 On the problems concerning S.'s succession by Xenokrates, see the comm. on *FGrHist* 1010 T 1.

7 See BYWATER (1883: 27).

8 On this problematic catalogue, see e.g. BYWATER (1883: 27-28); LANG (1911: 42-47; 48-49); MERLAN (1959: 200 n. 3); GIGANTE II (1987^4: 579-581); ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 212-217) and TARÁN (1981: 188-198).

9 See BYWATER (1883: 28) and MERLAN (1959: 200 n. 3).

10 Cf. TARÁN (1981: 191).

11 Cf. e.g. LANG (1911: 35); ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 214). Some scholars, e.g. GIGON (1958: 169 n. 42), think that S. wrote this work to rival with Aristotle's *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς ἢ Γρύλος*. Others, e.g. HIRZEL (1895: 313 n. 3) and MERLAN (1959: 204 n. 5), suppose that it might have been written against Isokrates' *ἐγκώμιον* rather than against Aristotle's work. But according to TARÁN (1981: 195) no evidence can be found for either of these views and he concludes that S.'s work may have contained no attack at all. KRÖMER (1971: 76-80) is of the opinion that Aristotle's work was a dialogue about rhetoric and not a eulogy of Gryllos. This scholar is not certain either whether S.'s writing was directed against Isokrates and the flood of ἐγκώμια he caused. If it was, one would expect the title *Πρὸς τὸν Γρύλλον*, by analogy with S.'s work *Πρὸς τὸν Ἀμάρτυρον*, in which he attacked Isokrates' speech in the trial against Euthynos.

(3) The *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον*, probably identical with the *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον*, cited in the latter form in Diog. Laert. 3,2 (F 1a) and in Philodemos' *Academicorum historia*[12] (T 3a-b). In a letter of Epikuros cited by Philodemos (T 3c), however, we may find another attestation of the form *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον*. See the commentary on T 3c and F 1a-b.

(3a-b) These two testimonia have been very important for the reconstruction of the relationship between the papyri P. Herc. 1021 and P. Herc. 164, both copies of Philodemos' work on the history of the Academy. In the margin of P. Herc. 1021, col. VI (T 3b) some names are added to a list of Plato's disciples, while in P. Herc. 164, F 12 (T 3a) the same names occur in the main text. This and other facts[13] have led to the conclusion that P. Herc. 1021 must have been Philodemos' draft, on which he made corrections and into which he inserted marginal notes to be included in the final version of the text, as we find it in P. Herc. 164. However, on palaeographical grounds scholars assume that another copy constituted the link between P. Herc. 1021 and P. Herc. 164, the latter of which can be considered to be a re-edition of Philodemos' *Academicorum historia*[14].

According to the latest reconstruction and interpretation of these two testimonia, Philodemos completed the list of Plato's pupils[15] by adding three names mentioned in S.'s *Perideipnon*. But, as we can see from the *apparatus criticus* to the texts, it took a long time for scholars to reach the present interpretation.

On the basis of Mekler's reading of P. Herc. 164 F 12 (T 3a), von Fritz conjectured that Timolaos had written a work called *Περίδειπνον*[16]. This reading was rejected by Crönert, but Isnardi Parente—although she adopted Crönert's version—and Wörle still believed that Timolaos had written a work with this title[17]. This contention

---

[12] For more information about this work and the reconstruction of the two papyri (P. Herc. 1021 and 164) by which it was transmitted, see most recently Gaiser (1988: 23-84); Dorandi (1991: 103-118) and Burkert (1993). Cf. also the commentary on T 3a-b.

[13] See e.g. Dorandi (1991: 111).

[14] Cf. Gaiser (1988: 56) and Dorandi (1991: 111), both with references to previous literature.

[15] For a comparison between Philodemos' list and the lists of Diog. Laert. 3,46 and Ibn al-Qifṭî, the Arab translator of a Greek biography of Plato (probably that of Theon of Smyrna), see Lasserre (1987: 436) and Gaiser (1988: 443-449).

[16] See von Fritz (1936).

[17] See Isnardi Parente (1980: 201; 216) and Wörle (1981: 160).

was refuted by Giannattasio Andria[18], who claimed that the sentence [ὡς] (...) Σπεύ[σιππος should be interpreted as a testimony to S., as he is attested with a work called *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον*, while such a work by Timolaos is otherwise unknown. Finally, Gaiser restored the gap after the word περιδείπνωι with the word Πλάτωνος[19]. His emendation was accepted by Dorandi[20].

In regard to the names of Plato's students, several hypotheses have been formulated. Until recently most authors regarded Ἀθηναῖος as an adjective to be connected with the preceding name Καλλιγένης. Gaiser[21], however, suggests the reading Ἁθηναῖος (= ὁ Ἀθηναῖος), which he connects with the following name Τιμόλα(ο)ς. According to this scholar his emendation is to be preferred to the old one because we would not have to assume a useless repetition of the name Timola(o)s. Another argument Gaiser advanced in support of this reading is his claim that the name Timola(o)s is attested in Athens at Plato's time, but not the name Kalligenes. However, according to the recently published second volume of the *Lexicon of Personal Greek Names*, containing the residents of Attica, it turns out that the name Kalligenes is attested in Athens in the fourth century B.C.[22]. Hence, onomatography does not seem to be of any help here. The most convincing argument in favour of Gaiser's hypothesis is the fact that the first-mentioned Timolaos is also preceded by his *ethnikon*. This can be taken to mean that S. wanted to stress the distinction between these two namesakes by giving their respective origins, while Kalligenes was not given an *ethnikon* because in his case there was no danger of confusion. A second solution proposed by Gaiser is the reading Ἀθήναιος, to be understood as a reference to Athenaios of Kyzikos, who was mentioned by Proklos[23] as the last mathematician in Plato's Academy[24]. In this case the name of Timolaos of Kyzikos would have been repeated and the name Kalligenes would probably refer to a citizen of Kyzikos as well. However, Gaiser himself prefers the first solution, and Dorandi[25] also accepted it recently, although at first he

[18] See GIANNATTASIO ANDRIA (1983: 81-82 with n. 10).
[19] See GAISER (1988: 185; 443).
[20] See DORANDI (1991: 135; 178).
[21] See GAISER (1988: 441-442).
[22] See OSBORNE – BYRNE (1994: 247) *s.v.* Καλλιγένης.
[23] PROKL. *In prim. Eucl. Elem. libr.* p. 67, l. 16-19 FRIEDLEIN.
[24] See GAISER (1988: 441-442).
[25] See DORANDI (1991: 224).

seemed reluctant to do so[26]. Except for Timolaos of Kyzikos[27], the students of Plato mentioned in S.'s *Perideipnon* are unknown to us, unless of course the mathematician Athenaios of Kyzikos figures in the list[28]. Whether they attended Plato's funeral banquet, is a matter for conjecture.

(3c) Another possible *testimonium* of S.'s work on Plato can be found in P. Herc. 1005 F 111, an excerpt from a letter of Epikuros quoted by Philodemos. However, we are obliged to alert the reader to the lacunas in the text, which have led scholars to propose very divergent emendations[29], especially for lines 6-9, which are directly relevant to the present inquiry. Having re-examined the papyrus, Angeli reconstructed the passage to make it read as a reference to a work by Aristippos on Sokrates[30] and to S.'s *Eulogy of Plato*. According to Angeli, this is the oldest attestation of the title *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* for the work of S. also referred to as *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον*[31]. Her conjecture is accepted by Gaiser[32], but one can wonder if the reading Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον would not be possible as well, assuming that we have here a genuine testimony to S.'s work on Plato. As Angeli acknowledges herself, it is a little difficult to see what called this work to Epikuros' attention. In her opinion, it was Epikuros' interest in the problem of Plato's deification, a problem which, according to some, might have been the central motif in S.'s work. Cf., however, the comm. on F 1-2.

(4) If the expression περὶ φιλοσόφων stands for the title of a work and not for its contents, this title is lacking in the catalogue of S.'s writings given in Diog. Laert. 4,4 (T 2). Yet, there is a possibility that the author used this phrase to refer to another work by S., possibly the *Φιλόσοφος* or the *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*. For a full discussion of this problem, see the commentary on F 4.

---

[26] See Dorandi (1985: 109).

[27] He is also enumerated in the lists of Diog. Laert. 3,46 and Ibn al-Qifṭî. On this Timolaos, see e.g. von Fritz (1936); Zeller II 1 (1922⁵: 421 n.1); Wörle (1981: 160-162); Trampedach (1994: 62-64).

[28] On this Athenaios, see Lasserre (1987: no. 15).

[29] Cf. the *apparatus criticus* with T 3c.

[30] Cf. the work *Πρὸς Σωκράτην* enumerated in Diogenes' list of Aristippos' writings (Diog. Laert. 2,83-85). But, for the controversy about Aristippos' literary activity, see Angeli (1988: 238-239).

[31] See Angeli (1986: 121). On the question of the title of S.'s work on Plato, cf. the comm. on F 1a-b.

[32] See Gaiser (1988: 438).

F

1. PLATO'S FUNERAL BANQUET (= EULOGY OF PLATO [?])

(1a-b) In F 1a Diogenes Laertios relates the story of Plato's Apollonian birth and mentions as his sources S.'s work entitled *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον*, Klearchos'[33] *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* and the second book of Anaxilides'[34] *Περὶ φιλοσόφων*. In Diogenes' catalogue of S.'s writings (T 2), however, the title *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον* is missing, while a work called *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* is attributed to S. Hence earlier scholars[35] tended to reject the title *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον*, assuming that in Diog. Laert. 3,2 (F 1a) the titles of the works by S. and Klearchos needed to be exchanged. But, as Tarán has demonstrated convincingly, their arguments are not compelling[36]. The hypothesis of reversed titles is, furthermore, contradicted by T 3a, where S. is attested with a work called *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον*, and F 1b, where the *Laus Platonis*, ascribed by Jerome to Klearchos, perfectly corresponds to the title *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* in F 1a[37]. Hence, unless S. wrote two similar works on Plato—a rather remote possibility[38]—we must assume that the two titles *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον* and *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* refer to one and the same work. Some arguments can be adduced in favour

---

33 There are two philosophers with the name Klearchos. The first attended the Academy for a short time and became tyrant of Herakleia, but died before Plato, in 352 B.C.; on this Klearchos, cf. Lenschau (1921); Trampedach (1994: 79-87). The other is Klearchos of Soloi (*FGrHist* 1021, *c.* 340-after 290 B.C.), a member of Aristotle's school, who wrote at least eight books of *Βίοι* or *Περὶ βίων*, "ways of life" rather than real biographies; cf. Wehrli III (1969²: 58). However, none of the extant fragments deals with Plato or his mother Periktione. Most probably, the latter author is meant here, cf. Kroll (1921); Pelling (1996³).

34 For a discussion about the exact form of the name, see e.g. Swift Riginos (1976: 9 n. 5); Tarán (1981: 233 n. 20). According to Tarán (1970), this author is not to be identified with the Pythagorean Anaxilaos of Larissa or with the Anaxilaos mentioned in Diog. Laert. 1,107. His view is contrary to that of Schwartz (1894), followed by Wehrli III (1969²: 46) and Dörrie (1990: 405).

35 See e.g. Hermann (1839: 97 n. 45); Lang (1911: 32-38; 60-61) and Gomperz (1925⁴: 549 n. 197.1).

36 See Tarán (1981: 230-232).

37 Lang's contention (1911: 33-34) that the change of titles is due to a "veteris librarii neglegentia" cannot be proved, cf. Tarán (1981: 232 n. 16). On the question why Jerome does not mention a title for S.'s work, cf. *infra*.

38 Cf. Schmutzler (1974: 63); contrary to Tarán (1981: 231; 235; 454), who does not exclude the possibility of two distinct writings. Another hypothesis advanced by Tarán (1981: 231-232), namely that the funeral banquet was a part of the *ἐγκώμιον*, is even less convincing.

of the latter assumption. Firstly, it is generally known that book titles were not used as rigidly in antiquity as they are nowadays and, secondly, the two titles can be explained if we understand the *Περίδειπνον* as an encomium of the dead[39].

As to the exact nature of the work, we are somewhat in the dark. Martin[40], followed by Schmutzler[41], considers the *Περίδειπνον* to be a real ἐπιτάφιος, namely the actual oration that was pronounced by S. on the occasion of Plato's funeral, while Boyancé[42] views it as a dialogue set at Plato's funeral banquet[43]. Tarán does not exclude the possibility that the *Περίδειπνον* was some kind of *symposium*, if the work contained the speeches of more than one disciple[44]. Anyhow, since there are so few fragments that can throw light on S.'s work on Plato, it seems impossible to classify it under a specific literary genre. We certainly would not dare to call it a genuine biography[45], as some authors do[46], although there may be an indication that the author treated Plato's life from his birth until his death. Cf. the comm. on F 3.

---

39 Cf. e.g. Martin (1931: 163), followed by Schmutzler (1974: 63).

40 See Martin (1931: 162-166), who bases his view primarily on Theon of Alexandria *Progymn.* 9 Patillon – Bolognesi, where it is stated that the ἐπιτάφιος is the ἐγκώμιον for the dead, and on Demosth. *Cor.* 22, where according to Martin the word περίδειπνον is used metaphorically in the sense of a funeral oration. However, Theon does not say that a περίδειπνον is the same thing as an ἐπιτάφιος, and in the passage of Demosthenes the word περίδειπνον can be translated as "funeral banquet" or "funeral feast"; cf. Tarán (1981: 231-232 n. 15).

41 See Schmutzler (1974: 63). On p. 64, the scholar expresses the conjecture that for his funeral oration S. chose the encomium as literary form. On the supposed parallels between S.'s work on Plato and Isokrates' *Euagoras*, see e.g. Lang (1911: 35-38) and Schmutzler (1974: 64-66); against this assumption, see Tarán (1981: 236-237).

42 See Boyancé (1936: 257-258).

43 Krömer (1971: 83 n. 3; 84) follows Lang (1911: 38; 47) in inferring from the place which the *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* occupies in Diogenes' list of S.'s writings that this work is not a dialogue. But on the defectiveness of this catalogue, cf. the comm. on T 2. Krömer's contention (1971: 84) that the description of Plato's funeral feast probably constituted a minor part of S.'s work, is based on a gratuitous interpretation of P. Herc. 164 F 12, refuted by the latest reconstruction of this text; cf. the comm. on T 3a-b.

44 See Tarán (1981: 232-233). Contrary to Martin (1931: 165-166), who is of the opinion that the *Περίδειπνον* consisted of one speech only.

45 Cf. Schmutzler (1974: 49).

46 See e.g. Dihle (1970[2]: 104); Swift Riginos (1976: 5). On p. 7-8, however, Swift Riginos is more careful, holding merely that the *accounts* (my italics) which Plato's disciples wrote about their master's life constitute the basis for later biographies.

The story of Plato's miraculous birth is reported by several ancient authors. Two of them, Diogenes Laertios and Jerome, mention S., Klearchos and Anaxilides as their sources. The question of the relationship between all these sources has recently been treated by Tarán, who arrives at the following two possibilities[47]:

(1) Jerome depends directly on Diogenes Laertios[48]. Diogenes—who most probably did not consult all of the sources he enumerates—either found his information in Anaxilides, who is mentioned last[49], or in a source unknown to us which referred to the three earlier authors.

(2) Jerome did not draw on Diogenes Laertios. In this case it is most likely that both are ultimately dependent upon a common source, unknown to us, which quoted S., Klearchos and Anaxilides[50].

In order to obtain a more decisive answer to the question, it may be useful to make a comparison between the reports of Diogenes and Jerome, while also taking into account the other sources that relate the same story without, however, mentioning S. as their source[51]. To start with, Diogenes seems to be more accurate in referring to his sources. Jerome omits the title of S.'s work, but mentions the titles for the other two authors. Either he did not know the title he omits because he did not find it in his source—in that case certainly not Diogenes—or he withheld it for some other reason. According to Bickel[52], Jerome gave the title *Laus* to the works of both S. and Klearchos. In this case too, it is unlikely that Diogenes was Jerome's source. Other possible explanations—e.g. that we should not understand the word *laus* as a title but rather as an indication of the contents of both works, or that Jerome simply overlooked the title of S.'s work—are less convincing. Furthermore, the church father does not say that the story was told as a rumour that circulated in Athens[53], and finally, there are also some divergencies in regard to the contents of the story.

---

[47] See TARÁN (1981: 233).

[48] Cf. LANG (1911: 61).

[49] Cf. DÖRRIE (1990: 405).

[50] Cf. BICKEL (1915: 133-139), who is of the opinion that Jerome depended on Porphyry and that Porphyry and Diogenes had Thrasyllos as their common source. GIGON (1986: 141) is also convinced that Jerome used Porphyry, but in his view either Porphyry read Diogenes or both consulted Anaxilides independently. However, there is no hard evidence to prove either of these hypotheses.

[51] Cf. SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 9-15, anecdote 1) and DÖRRIE (1990: 404-414, Baustein 58), who give a detailed analysis of all the sources for Plato's Apollonian birth.

[52] See BICKEL (1915: 133 n. 1).

[53] ὡς Ἀθήνησιν ἦν λόγος; cf. PLUT. *Quaest. conv.* 8,1,2 (717 d-e): λεγομένης; APUL. *Plat.* 1,1: sunt qui (...) dicant; OLYMP. *In Plat. Alcib.* 2,21-24 WESTERINK: φασὶν and cf. *infra*.

Diogenes' text contains the following elements: Ariston tried violently to make love to Periktione, but did not succeed; when he gave up his attempt, he saw an apparition of Apollo[54], and from this moment on had no intercourse with Periktione until Plato was born. Diogenes does not explicitly say that Periktione was a virgin at the time of Plato's conception, but this can be gathered from the phrases ὡραίαν οὖσαν τὴν Περικτιόνην and καθαρὰν γάμου φυλάξαι ἕως τῆς ἀποκυήσεως[55], which seem to point to an ἐγγύη-situation: Ariston was Periktione's legal husband and wanted to consummate the marriage now that his wife had reached the age of puberty, but was unsuccessful. If Ariston—having had a vision of Apollo—left Periktione untouched until the delivery, this must mean that Apollo was somehow regarded as Plato's real father, even though this is not actually mentioned by Diogenes either[56]. Dörrie is of the opinion that Periktione's virginity and Apollo's paternity are not implied in Diogenes' version[57]. But his own contention that Periktione was already pregnant when the incident took place is not supported by the text at all.

In Jerome's summarized account of the story, S., Klearchos and Anaxilides believe that Plato was the son of a virgin. Did he find this information in his source or did he only make explicit what was implied in it? Most probably the latter is the case. That he emphasized Periktione's virginity so much, can be explained by the context in which the story was told: a praise of virginity with examples from the heathen world. Another difference in Jerome's account is that Apollo's *fasma* and not Ariston assaults Periktione. Tarán assumes that the church father changed the story deliberately "in order to downgrade Plato's alleged miraculous birth", or that he misunderstood his source[58]. But is it not possible that Jerome found this version in his own source? Apuleius[59] had already mentioned the sexual

---

54 As Swift Riginos (1976: 10) and Tarán (1981: 228 n. 4) rightly remark, Diogenes does not specify that Ariston had this vision in a dream. The dream is found in Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 8,1,2 (717 d-e): καθ' ὕπνον, and Anon. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* 2,15-17 Westerink: ὄνειρον; but since these authors do not refer to S., there is no way of knowing whether the dream was part of S.'s version of the story or not.

55 See *LSJ s.v. ὡραῖος* III: "of persons, *seasonable* or *ripe* for a thing, c. gen." In this context the word ὡραίαν obviously goes with the genitive γάμου, which means that Periktione was ripe for sexual intercourse, cf. Tarán (1981: 228); Brisson (1992: 3629 n. 27).

56 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 10) and Tarán (1981: 228).

57 See Dörrie (1990: 406-407).

58 See Tarán (1981: 234 n. 24).

59 Apul. *Plat.* 1,1: sunt qui Platonem augustiore conceptu prosatum dicant, cum quidem Apollinis figuratio Perictione se miscuisset; cf. Orig. *C. Cels.* 1,37 and 6,8; Olymp. *In Plat. Alcib.* 2,17-24 Westerink; *Suda* Π 1707 *s.v.* Πλάτων.

union between Apollo's *figuratio* and Plato's mother[60]. This may be a deduction of Apuleius himself or of his source, but we should not overlook the possibility that it was already part of S.'s version, since *Plat.* 1,2 (F 2) seems to imply that Apuleius was familiar with S.'s work on Plato[61].

To conclude: the dissimilarities between F 1a and 1b seem to indicate that Jerome was not immediately dependent on Diogenes Laertios. There is no hard evidence for the assumption of many scholars[62] that Diogenes gives the most original version of the story, since we have seen that Jerome's version may also ultimately go back to S. However, there is some logic in Tarán's assertion that "it is intelligible that the ὄψις of Apollo that appeared to Ariston according to Diogenes Laertius became the *figuratio* or the *fasma* of Apollo which had sexual intercourse with Periktione rather than that the latter version could have given origin to Diogenes' account"[63].

It is impossible to say who may have been the ultimate common source of Diogenes Laertios and Jerome. But it may be of interest in this context to refer to Origenes[64], who thinks (οἶμαι) that his version of Plato's birth came from Aristandros, probably the soothsayer of Alexander the Great,[65] and says that many other Platonists have told this story in their "biographies of Plato"[66]. It would be tempting to see in this Aristandros the link between the accounts of Plato's pupils and later tradition[67], were there not some elements that appear suspect. Firstly, Origenes himself is not very certain about his source, and, secondly, Plato's mother is given the name Amphiktione instead of Periktione[68]. Hence Dörrie assumes that we have here a "third-

---

60 Tarán (1981: 228 n. 4) is uncertain whether "Jerome too refers to the *figuratio* of Apollo having had sexual intercourse with Periktione", but it is unclear what else the church father could have meant.

61 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 13).

62 See e.g. Swift Riginos (1976: 10); Tarán (1981: 228); Dörrie (1990: 406).

63 See Tarán (1981: 234 n. 24).

64 Orig. *C. Cels.* 6,8: Καὶ πρὸς ταῦτά φημι ὅτι περὶ μὲν Πλάτωνος Ἀρίστανδρος οἶμαι ἀνέγραψεν ὡς οὐκ Ἀρίστωνος υἱοῦ ἀλλὰ φάσματος, ἐν Ἀπόλλωνος εἴδει προσελθόντος τῇ Ἀμφικτιόνῃ [*sic*]· καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ πλείονες τῶν Πλατωνικῶν ἐν τῷ Πλάτωνος βίῳ τοιαῦτ᾽ εἰρήκασι.

65 So e.g. Geffcken Ib (1926: 31 n.13); Swift Riginos (1976: 11); Dörrie (1990: 412).

66 It is not very clear who Origenes is referring to when he mentions Πλατωνικοί who wrote biographies of Plato. Swift Riginos (1976: 13) seems to think that Origenes means Aristandros' contemporaries. But in our view it is very unlikely that the term βίος could have been used to refer to their works; cf. Dörrie (1990: 413), who is of the opinion that Origenes meant the Platonists who came after Aristandros.

67 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 15).

68 Cf. also Orig. *C. Cels.* 1,37.

rate reference" which does not go back to an authentic work of Aristandros, but rather to some dream book falsely attributed to Alexander's seer[69].

What was S.'s aim when he told the story of Plato's Apollonian birth? Earlier scholars were convinced that S. wanted to represent Plato as the son of a god and that by doing this, he paved the way for the cult of Plato which originated in the Academy shortly after the philosopher's death[70]. Swift Riginos and Tarán contended that S. just told the anecdote as a story that was rumoured in Athens, using the phrase ὡς Ἀθήνησιν ἦν λόγος to distance himself from the story because he did not believe it himself[71]. And recently Dörrie claimed that S. only wanted to prove that Plato, from his birth onwards, enjoyed the protection of Apollo[72].

The solution to this problem is related to the question as to which elements in the story can be attributed to S. himself. Dörrie, who is of the opinion that only Diogenes' version can be trusted and should be read literally, infers that S. did not intend to present Plato as the son of Apollo[73]. According to this scholar, S. just said that the god had ensured that after Plato's conception Ariston observed cultic chastity so that Plato would be born in all purity[74]. However, Dörrie's whole theory seems to be based on the assumption that Periktione was already pregnant by Ariston when he tried to assault her, which is —as shown above—an unwarranted reading of Diogenes' text[75]. The argument that S. must have known that Plato was not the eldest child of Ariston and Periktione[76] and therefore cannot have insinuated that

---

69 See Dörrie (1990: 412-413).

70 See e.g. Boyancé (1936: 267-268) and Reverdin (1945: 140-141), also Schmutzler (1974: 66); Novotný (1977: 222-223) and Isnardi Parente (1980: 386-387). On the kind of cult received by Plato, cf. Boyancé (1936: 249-275), who thinks that he was heroized and Reverdin (1945: 139-146), who is of the opinion that he was worshipped as a θεός or a δαίμων. According to Isnardi Parente (1980: 386-387), it is very difficult to solve this question. However, she assumes that if Plato was ever venerated in the Academy, S. must have laid the foundation of the cult.

71 See Swift Riginos (1976: 10) and Tarán (1981: 228-229). According to Brisson (1992: 3630), Tarán wondered whether S. did not actually mention this story in order to put an end to the rumour. But personally this does not seem to me to be implied by Tarán.

72 See Dörrie (1990: 408-409).

73 See Dörrie (1990: 405-409).

74 Cf. Anon. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* 2,15-20 Westerink.

75 Cf. *supra.*

76 Adeimantos and probably also Glaukon were older than Plato; cf. e.g. Burnet (1964[2]: 168-169) and Davies (1971: 332-333).

his uncle was the product of a virgin birth[77], is not valid either, since it was not necessarily S.'s intention to tell the truth. One has to keep in mind that this anecdote was probably told during a funeral oration, *i.e.* an occasion for lavishing praise on the dead. Finally, the contention that the idea of a historical figure having a divine father was only intelligible from the Hellenistic age onwards, when stories were circulated about Alexander's divine origin, is refuted by the fact that Pythagoras was also considered by some of Plato's scholars to be the son of Apollo[78].

Swift Riginos and Tarán are undoubtedly right in their observation that S. probably did not believe in Plato's miraculous birth himself[79]. However, their supposition that S. wished to dissociate himself from the story[80], is not very convincing. To start with, we are not certain whether the phrase ὡς Ἀθήνησιν ἦν λόγος belonged to S.'s own account. It might just as well have come from one of the other sources quoted by Diogenes, from one of Diogenes' intermediary sources or—even though this is less probable—from Diogenes himself. And even if S. actually used the phrase, he may have done so in order to reach a certain aim.

Whether that aim was to depict Plato as a being of divine origin or just to illustrate the high regard in which his uncle was held[81], is hard to say. If some of the other anecdotes about Plato's Apollonian nature[82] could be traced back to S., as some scholars are only too willing to believe[83], this would plead in favour of the first assumption. However, one has to admit that the story under discussion is the only one which can be attributed with certainty to Plato's nephew.

---

77 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 10 n. 8) and Tarán (1981: 228-229).

78 Cf. Eudoxos and Xenokrates *ap.* Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 2,7. This was also remarked in Dörrie (1990: 407 n. 1; 408 n. 2), by those who completed Dörrie's commentary after the latter's sudden death. On the question whether the story about Pythagoras was older than that about Plato or not, cf. *infra* .

79 See Swift Riginos (1976: 10) and Tarán (1981: 228-229).

80 Cf. Dörrie (1990: 406), who is of the same opinion, even though this seems to run counter to his own inference (1990: 408) that S. wanted to demonstrate Plato's protection by Apollo.

81 Cf. Tarán (1981: 229-230 n. 6).

82 For an analysis of the other anecdotes emphasizing Plato's Apollonian nature, see Swift Riginos (1976: 15-32, anecdotes 2-9); cf. Dörrie (1990: Bausteine 59-60).

83 Boyancé (1936: 254-255); Reverdin (1945: 141) and Isnardi Parente (1980: F 149 and 150) assume that the anecdote about Plato dying on his 81st birthday may come from S., since the latter worked on mystic arithmology; this view is opposed by Tarán (1980: 229 n. 6). Gigon (1986: 141-142) went even further and attibuted to S.'s *Περίδειπνον* almost all the anecdotes which demonstrate the bond between Apollo, Plato and Sokrates. According to Fairweather (1974: 273), however, those stories were probably invented by later biographers.

On the origin of the story about Plato's Apollonian birth there are three major hypotheses. Several scholars[84] think its roots are to be sought in the legend concerning Pythagoras, who was also considered by some to be the son of Apollo. But, as Swift Riginos rightly remarks, it is not certain which legend originated first, since the earliest reliable sources for both stories are disciples of Plato[85]. According to Swift Riginos[86], the story about Plato's miraculous birth may have been inspired—just as the other anecdotes about his Apollonian nature—by Plato's own writings, in which the philosopher showed special devotion to the god Apollo[87]. Another explanation advanced by the same scholar[88], is that an attribute of many poets—namely Apollonian descent—was transferred to the philosopher Plato.

(2) In this passage S. praises the virtues of Plato, which were manifest from his childhood on. Even though Apuleius[89] does not mention a book title, we can assume[90] that this fragment ultimately derives from S.'s work known as *Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον* or *Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον* (cf. the comm. on F 1a-b), since such a laudation is a typical item in a funeral oration. This supposition gains some support from the previous paragraph[91], in which Apuleius reported the story of the philosopher's divine parentage, a tale which S. narrated in his work on Plato (cf. F 1a-b). Although it is rather improbable that Apuleius consulted

---

84 See e.g. Boyancé (1936: 260-261); Taeger (1957: 156); Schmutzler (1974: 66); Novotný (1977: 223).

85 See Swift Riginos (1976: 13-14). When Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 2,7 rejects the story of Pythagoras' Apollonian birth, he cites Epimenides (*FGrHist* 457 F 16), Eudoxos (F 324 Lasserre) and Xenokrates (F 22 Heinze = F 221 Isnardi Parente) as his sources for it. According to Lasserre (1966: 264), the reference to Epimenides—who is mentioned by Aristotle as one of Pythagoras' teachers—proves that this story belonged to the old Pythagorean legend and was therefore older than the similar story about Plato; cf. Isnardi Parente (1982: 413-414). However, the figure of Epimenides is very shady and the idea of divine ancestry contradicts the Pythagorean belief in reincarnation, which is stressed in the earlier accounts of Pythagoras' descent; cf. Burkert (1972: 124; 146). On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the relationship between Pythagoras and Apollo also played an important role in the Pythagorean school.

86 See Swift Riginos (1976: 14; 30).

87 E.g. *Phaedo* 84e-85b, where Plato depicts the philosopher as the real servant of Apollo.

88 See Swift Riginos (1976: 32).

89 Apuleius' authorship of *De Platone et eius dogmate* is nowadays generally accepted, cf. Hijmans (1987: 408).

90 Cf. e.g. Lang (1911: 35-36; 61); Martin (1931: 163); Schmutzler (1974: 63); Isnardi Parente (1980: 388); Tarán (1981: 235).

91 Cf. *supra*, n. 59.

S.'s work directly[92]—for in that case he would have cited S.'s name in *Plat.* 1,1 as well—it is very tempting to think of an intermediary source which depended on S.—directly or indirectly—for both accounts.

As Isnardi Parente remarked, this passage could be used as an argument by those who claim that S. wanted to deify his uncle[93]. Yet it should be noted that the sentence in which Plato is said to have possessed superhuman qualities does not necessarily belong to the quotation from S.[94], and, secondly, that nothing in the quotation suggests that he did[95].

According to Apuleius, S. was *'domesticis documentis instructus'*. By making this remark he obviously wanted to emphasize S.'s privileged position as a source for Plato's youth[96]. However, there is no reason to think that the phrase *'domesticis documentis'* points to some kind of family archive, given the fact that family tradition was usually transmitted orally in classical Athens[97]. Moreover, it is rather doubtful whether S. relied on family tradition where Plato's virtues are concerned, since the qualities enumerated fit in remarkably well with the characteristics which Plato himself ascribed to the philosophic nature[98].

(3) According to K. Gaiser[99], the *additamentum* to P.HERC. 1021 col. V, l. 21-22 may constitute another fragment of S.'s work on Plato. Since no book title and not even S.'s name are quoted, the identification depends entirely upon the restoration and interpretation of the word τἀδελφιδ.[, which Gaiser emends to τὰ or τὸ τοῦ ἀδελφιδοῦ meaning "the version, the description of the (*sc.* Plato's) nephew"[100]. Although at first[101] Lasserre also interpreted the *scholion* as an allusion

[92] Cf. TARÁN (1981: 235).

[93] See ISNARDI PARENTE (1981: 388).

[94] Cf. e.g. SCHMUTZLER (1974: 124-125), who found several indications which point to Apuleius as author of the sentence. According to this scholar, it was meant to link the two first chapters of Apuleius' biography of Plato. HIJMANS (1987: 427 n. 130) sees in the phrase an expression of Apuleius' "extraordinary reverence" for the Athenian philosopher.

[95] Cf. TARÁN (1981: 235).

[96] Cf. the comm. on T 1.

[97] See THOMAS (1989: 100-108, esp. p. 100); cf. SCHMUTZLER (1974: 125), who understands the phrase to be a reference to oral reports of S.'s relatives.

[98] Cf. TARÁN (1981: 236) with references to some passages.

[99] Cf. ISNARDI PARENTE (1982: 355-359) and DORANDI (1991: 222).

[100] See GAISER (1988: 437). Yet, it should be noted, as GAISER (1983: 58 n. 31) himself did, that there are as yet no linguistic parallels for this interpretation.

[101] See LASSERRE (1983b: 67).

to S.'s report of Plato's death, he afterwards[102] changed his mind and suggested that it points to Plato's grandnieces, which the philosopher had to marry off according to Pseudo-Plato's *Letter thirteen*[103]. In Lasserre's opinion[104], the annotation relates to l. 35-36, which he emended to [Ἕρμιπ]πος [δέ φησιν ἐν γά]μοις[105]: a reference to Hermippos' version of Plato's demise, according to which the latter passed away during a wedding feast (cf. *FGrHist* 1026 F 70)[106]. But if we can go by Gaiser's reading of l. 32-33[107]—which is accepted by Dorandi[108]—the enumeration of Plato's pupils starts from these lines and that would exclude the possibility that l. 35-36 dealt with Plato's death. Moreover, Lasserre[109] does not explain the relationship between Neanthes of Kyzikos (*FGrHist* 1032), whose name—as he admits himself—is clearly legible in the marginal note, and the reference to Hermippos' narrative or Plato's grandnieces. In Gaiser's reconstruction everything makes perfect sense. The annotation opposes S.'s assertion that Plato died during his sleep to the description of Plato's final night[110] as it was transmitted by Neanthes[111], based on the account of Philippos of Opus[112] (cf. *FGrHist* 1011 F 1). Given the lacunas in the papyrus, all reconstructions must necessarily remain hypothetical. Nevertheless, we must admit with Dorandi[113] that Gaiser's hypothesis seems more plausible than that of Lasserre.

---

[102] See Lasserre (1987: 610).
[103] [Plat.] *Epist.* 13, 361c-d.
[104] See Lasserre (1987: 610).
[105] Gaiser (1988: 181) restored l. 35-38 as follows: Σπεύσιπ]π̣ος | [Ἀθηναῖος ὁ τὸ] μου̣σ[ε]ῖ̣ο̣ν̣ | [παρὰ Πλάτω]ν̣ο̣[ς διαδεξά|μενος (...).
[106] Hermippos' account may have been inspired by the spurious Plato letter, cf. Brisson (1992: 3631-3632). Ritter's assumption (1909: 332-334) that Plato really died on the wedding day of one of his grandnieces should be dismissed. For a full discussion of the origin of Hermippos' narrative, see the comm. on *FGrHist* 1026 F 70.
[107] See Gaiser (1988: 181): Π̣λ̣άτ̣ω̣ν̣ο̣ς μ[αθη|τα]ὶ ἦ̣σ̣[α]ν (...).
[108] See Dorandi (1991: 134).
[109] See Lasserre (1987: 610).
[110] On the restoration and interpretation of this passage, Lasserre (1983a); (1987: 162-163; 219-220; 607-611) and Gaiser (1988: 176-181, 421-436) do not agree either; cf. the comm. on *FGrHist* 1011 F 1.
[111] Lasserre (1983a: 171 n. 7); (1983b: 66-67); (1987: 602-603; 668-669) conjectured Hermodoros (*FGrHist* 1008) as Philodemos' immediate source for, among other things, his account of Plato's last moments; against his arguments, see Gaiser (1988: 108-109).
[112] The identification of Philippos of Opus in col. III, l. 35, as proposed by Mekler (1902: XXVII), is now generally accepted, cf. Tarán (1975: 125 n. 519; 133 n. 555), Lasserre (1987: no. 20 F 14a), Gaiser (1988: 421).
[113] See Dorandi (1991: 222).

If the fragment under discussion actually refers to a passage from S.'s work on Plato, this would endorse the assumption that in this work S. discussed his uncle's life from his birth (cf. F 1a-b) to his dying day[114]. The assertion that "*others* reported the nephew's version" would suggest that Philodemos did not consult S. directly[115]. He more likely depended—for this fragment as well as for T 3a-b—on an intermediary source, possibly a more recent biographer whose name is unknown to us[116].

On the way in which the most famous philosopher of all time left this world, there exist several anecdotes[117]. The story that Plato emitted his last breath while he was sleeping, is one of them. Besides its possible mention by S., it is also recorded in two other sources.

In his essay *On the Soul*[118] Tertullianus mentioned Plato, who died in his sleep, together with Chilon, who died while congratulating his son on his Olympic victory[119]; Kleidemos (*FGrHist* 323 T 2), who passed away when he was honoured for his historical work, and Crassus[120], who laughed himself to death. It is interesting to note how these ways of dying, which were considered by the Ancients as examples of a happy death[121], are used by the Christian author to illustrate the cruelty of a death which strikes on occasions when it would be more pleasant to live.

---

[114] Cf. Gaiser (1988: 110).
[115] Contrary to the hopes of Isnardi Parente (1982: 359).
[116] Cf. Gaiser (1988: 109-110; 437-438).
[117] Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 194-198, anecdotes 143-148).
[118] Tert. *De anima* 52,3: Nam etsi prae gaudio quis spiritum exhalet, ut Chilon Spartanus dum victorem Olympiae filium amplectitur, etsi prae gloria, ut Clidemus Atheniensis, dum ob historici stili praestantiam auro coronatur, *etsi per somnum (*codd. *somnium), ut Plato,* etsi per risum, ut P. Crassus, multo violentior mors quae per aliena grassatur, quae animam per commoda expellit, quae tunc mori affert, cum iocundius vivere est in exultatione in honore in requie in voluptate. While Waszink (1947: 537) was hesitant, scholars nowadays generally accept the correction proposed by Zeller II 1 (1922[5]: 427 n. 2), cf. e.g. Wehrli Suppl. I (1974: 70-71); Swift Riginos (1976: 195); Gaiser (1988: 436).
[119] Cf. *FGrHist* 1026 F 18.
[120] Tertullianus was probably referring to M. Licinius Crassus, the grandfather of P. Crassus, of whom the satirist Lucilius said that he had laughed only once in his entire life, cf. Münzer (1926). As this scholar remarked, only by combining Lucilius' statement with the account in Tertullianus can we understand the point of the joke: all his life Licinius had refrained from laughing; so the one time that he did laugh, it resulted in his death.
[121] On the stock motive of a blessed death as the fulfilment of a good life, cf. Fairweather (1974: 269-270).

In the *Suda*[122] we read that Plato died in his sleep after feasting sumptuously at a celebration. This story reminds us of the anecdotes reported in Diog. Laert. 6,25, in which Diogenes the Cynic blamed Plato for his voracity[123], and it looks as if the author or his source wanted to suggest that Plato died because of indulgence in food and drink[124]. The *Suda*'s version seems to be a combination of Tertullianus' statement—which might ultimately go back to S.—with Hermippos' account, in which Plato died at a wedding banquet[125]. However, to infer from this that Hermippos—who must have been acquainted with the works of S. and Neanthes—might have specified that Plato didn't die *during* but *after* the wedding banquet[126], seems to be going too far[127].

2. ON PHILOSOPHERS (= ON PHILOSOPHY / THE PHILOSOPHER [?])

(4) The indication περὶ φιλοσόφων is not very clear. Is Diogenes quoting the title of a work by S. or does he only refer to the contents of one of S.'s works which dealt with philosophers? Most editors of this fragment reproduce the phrase with a capital letter and hence seem to consider it to be a title. Long tentatively suggested correcting the title *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* in Diog. Laert. 4,4 to *Περὶ φιλοσόφων* (cf. *app. crit.* with T 2), but this emendation is unnecessary[128]. Lang and Isnardi Parente argued that *Περὶ φιλοσόφων* cannot be the correct title of the work, since such a title would seem to indicate a systematic survey

---

122 *Suda* Π 1707 *s.v.* Πλάτων: Εὐωχήθη δ' ἐν ἑορτῇ καὶ ὑπνῶν ἀπεβίω.

123 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 71; 113-114, anecdotes 68-69).

124 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 195 with n. 7), who made this remark in connection with Hermippos' story that Plato expired at a wedding feast. But, as J. Bollansée points out in the comm. on *FGrHist* 1026 F 70, Hermippos' narrative (which does not mention the detail of the sleep) seems to have stressed the irony of the fact that Plato, a confirmed bachelor, died at a wedding. That this element is completely missing in the *Suda*'s version indicates that the author (or his source) had a different purpose in telling the story. What this aim was, can be deduced from the use of the verb εὐωχέω, which emphasizes the aspect of sumptuosity and seems to imply that Plato died as a result of his gluttony.

125 Cf., however, the comm. on *FGrHist* 1026 F 70 for the exact relation between Hermippos and the *Suda*.

126 This is what Gaiser (1988: 438) suggests.

127 Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 195 n. 7): "Suidas' report (...) is not a reliable indication that Hermippus' original account had Plato's death occurring while he slept".

128 Cf. Tarán (1981: 192-193), who mentions several other Academics and Peripatetics who wrote a work entitled *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*.

of previous philosophers, and this kind of work is not attested at S.'s time[129]. Hence they attributed the present fragment to the work *Φιλόσοφος*. But, as Tarán rightly observed, the passage may just as well be taken from the *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* or even from another work by S.[130].

If the phrase περὶ φιλοσόφων refers to the contents of a work on philosophy (e.g. *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*), the biographical character of the fragment on Parmenides is most probably a mere coincidence; if it indicates a dialogue on 'The Philosopher' (e.g. *Φιλόσοφος*)[131], the reference to Parmenides as a lawgiver might constitute an illustration of a characteristic of the ideal philosopher[132]. Whatever the exact context of the fragment under discussion, it is not surprising that a member of the Platonic school should be interested in the political activity of an earlier philosopher[133].

The note on Parmenides' activity as a lawgiver is also reported by Strabo[134] and by Plutarch[135], who further relates how the magistrates of Elea annually made the citizens swear that they would observe the

---

[129] See LANG (1911: 41-42; 51-52) and ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 213; 364-365).

[130] See TARÁN (1981: 237).

[131] So ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 213-214), who follows HIRZEL (1895: 313) in conjecturing that by means of the *Φιλόσοφος* S. may have intended to complete the trilogy which Plato had started with the dialogues *Σοφιστής* and *Πολιτικός*.

[132] Cf. ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 365). For examples of other early philosophers who were said to have played a leading part in the affairs of their city, see e.g. JAEGER (1928: 415 = 1960: 383); cf. *infra*, n. 136.

[133] Cf. CLEM. Alex. *Strom.* 2,4,19,3 (F 2 LANG = F 119 ISNARDI PARENTE = F 4 TARÁN): Σπεύσιππος γὰρ ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Κλεοφῶντα πρώτῳ τὰ ὅμοια τῷ Πλάτωνι ἔοικε διὰ τούτου γράφειν· "Εἰ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία σπουδαῖον ὅ τε σοφὸς μόνος βασιλεὺς καὶ ἄρχων, ὁ νόμος λόγος ὢν ὀρθὸς σπουδαῖος". On the political interests of Plato's pupils, see e.g. WÖRLE (1981) and most recently BRUNT (1993: 282-342) and TRAMPEDACH (1994). S.'s own involvement in daily politics is illustrated by his support for Dio of Syracuse in his actions against Dionysios II and by the (probably authentic) letter of recommendation which he wrote to Philip II on behalf of the historiographer Antipatros of Magnesia, cf. e.g. WÖRLE (1981: 28-31); MEISSNER (1992: 374 with n. 30; 108-109 with n. 201) and TRAMPEDACH (1994: 110; 112; 138-140; 268), all with references to ancient sources and modern literature. From ATH. 7,279 e, WÖRLE (1981: 31-33) deduced furthermore that S.—like Erastos, Koriskos, Aristotle and Xenokrates—would have had connections with Hermias, the tyrant of Atarneus. Although this supposition is quite plausible, there is no hard evidence to prove it; cf. TRAMPEDACH (1994: 140). On Hermias, who is often said to have reformed his rule under the influence of the Academics, see most recently TRAMPEDACH (1994: 66-79).

[134] STRAB. 6,1,1 (C 252): (...) οἱ δὲ νῦν Ἐλέαν ὀνομάζουσιν, ἐξ ἧς Παρμενίδης καὶ Ζήνων ἐγένοντο, ἄνδρες Πυθαγόρειοι. Δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ δι' ἐκείνους καὶ ἔτι πρότερον εὐνομηθῆναι.

[135] PLUT. *Adv. Col.* 32 (1126 a-b): Παρμενίδης δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδα διεκόσμησε νόμοις ἀρίστοις, ὥστε τὰς ἀρχὰς καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξορκοῦν τοὺς πολίτας ἐμμένειν τοῖς Παρμενίδου νόμοις.

Parmenidean laws. Neither Strabo nor Plutarch mention their source, but there is a considerable possibility that through some intermediary sources they are ultimately drawing on S., who gives the earliest account of the facts[136]. It is hard to say who Diogenes depends on. Tarán suggests that it may have been Favorinos, seeing that Diogenes often draws on him and that Favorinos is cited immediately before and after the fragment under discussion[137].

Els Theys

Text editions and translations

A. Angeli, *Accessione Speusippea*, in *PP* 41 (1986), p. 120-121.
A. Angeli, *Agli amici di scuola (PHerc. 1005). Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Epicuro 7), Napoli 1988.
* E. Bickel, *Diatribe in Senecae philosophi fragmenta*, I. *Fragmenta de matrimonio*, Leipzig 1915.
W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Philosophen- und Literaturgeschichte* (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 6), Leipzig 1906 (= Amsterdam 1965).
H. Diels – W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Dublin - Zürich 1951^6 (= 1966).
H. Dörrie, *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus. Bausteine 36-72: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben und bearbeitet von M. Baltes unter Mitarbeit von A. Dörrie und F. Mann* (Der Platonismus in der Antike 2), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1990.
* T. Dorandi, *Filodemo, Storia dei filosofi [.] Platone e l'Academia (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Epicuro 12), Napoli 1991.
T. Dorandi, *Il Papiro ercolanese 164*, in *CErc* 15 (1985), p. 101-111.
* K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri* (Supplementum Platonicum 1), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1988.

[136] Burnet (1930^4: 171 with n. 2; 311) and Kirk – Raven (1957: 265) considered Timaios of Tauromenion to be the ultimate source of the story, Gigon (1979^2: 220) and Untersteiner (1958: 21) thought of Demokritos, but both hypotheses are convincingly rejected by Tarán (1981: 238). Given the differences between the reports of Strabo and Plutarch, Tarán finds it rather improbable that they used the same immediate source. As one of the intermediary sources he conjectures Dikaiarchos (F 25-46 Wehrli I), who played a vital part in disseminating the image of the early philosophers as legislators and practical men; cf. e.g. Jaeger (1928: 415 = 1960: 383) and Untersteiner (1958: 21).
[137] See Tarán (1981: 239).

G. Giannantoni, *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae* (Elenchos 18), II, Napoli 1990.
M. Gigante, *Diogene Laerzio, Vite dei filosofi* I-II, Bari 1987[4].
M. Isnardi Parente, *Senocrate-Ermodoro, Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Platone 3), Napoli 1982.
M. Isnardi Parente, *Speusippo, Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Platone 1), Napoli 1980.
G.S. Kirk – J.E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge 1957.
G.S. Kirk – J.E. Raven – M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge - London - New York - … 1983[2].
P. Lang, *De Speusippi Academici scriptis. Accedunt fragmenta*, Diss. Bonn 1911 (= Frankfurt am Main 1964).
F. Lasserre, *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Texte und Kommentare 4), Berlin 1966.
F. Lasserre, *De Léodamas de Thasos à Philippe d'Oponte. Témoignages et fragments. Édition, traduction et commentaire* (La scuola di Platone 2), Napoli 1987.
* H.S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* I-II (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964 (= 1966).
S. Mekler, *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculanensis*, Berlin 1902 (= 1958).
* C. Moreschini, *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis opera quae supersunt*, III. *De philosophia libri* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Stuttgart - Leipzig 1991.
L. Tarán, *Academica: Plato, Philip of Opus, and the Pseudo-Platonic Epinomis* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 107), Philadelphia 1975.
L. Tarán, *Speusippus of Athens. A Critical Study with a Collection of the Related Texts and Commentary* (Philosophia Antiqua 39), Leiden 1981.
M. Untersteiner, *Parmenide. Testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Bibliotheca di studi superiori 38), Firenze 1958 (= 1967).
J.H. Waszink, Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus, *De anima. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Amsterdam 1947.
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, I. *Dikaiarchos*, Basel - Stuttgart, 1967[2].
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, III. *Klearchos*, Basel - Stuttgart, 1969[2].
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Suppl. I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel - Stuttgart, 1974.

Secondary literature

P. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs. Études d'histoire et de psychologie religieuses*, Paris 1936 (= 1972).
L. Brisson, *Diogène Laërce, 'Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres', Livre III: Structure et contenu*, in W. Haase (ed.), *ANRW* II 36,5, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 3619-3760.

W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism. Translated by E.L. Minar Jr.*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1972.
W. Burkert, *Platon in Nahaufnahme. Ein Buch aus Herculaneum*, Stuttgart - Leipzig 1993.
J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, London 1930⁴.
J. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy. Thales to Plato*, London - Melbourne - Toronto - New York 1964² (= 1968).
I. Bywater, *The Cleophons in Aristotle*, in *JPh* 12 (1883), p. 17-30.
A.-H. Chroust, *Speusippos succeeds Plato in the Scholarchate of the Academy*, in *REG* 84 (1971), p. 338-341.
J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.
K. Gaiser, *La biografia di Platone in Filodemo: nuovi dati dal PHerc. 1021*, in *CErc* 13 (1983), p. 53-62.
R. Giannattasio Andria, *Sul PHerc. 164*, in *CErc* 13 (1983), p. 81-83.
O. Gigon, *Das dritte Buch des Diogenes Laertios*, in *Elenchos* 7 (1986), p. 133-188.
O. Gigon, *Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten*, in *MH* 15 (1958), p. 147-193.
O. Gigon, *Sokrates. Sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*, Bern - München 1979².
T. Gomperz, *Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* II, Berlin - Leipzig 1925⁴ (= 1973).
K.F. Hermann, *Geschichte und System der platonischen Philosophie*, Heidelberg 1839.
B.L. Hijmans Jr., *Apuleius, Philosophus Platonicus*, in *ANRW* II 36,1, Berlin - New York 1987, p. 395-475.
R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog* I, Leipzig 1895.
W. Jaeger, *Über Ursprung und Kreislauf des philosophischen Lebensideals*, in *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 25 (1928), p. 390-421 (= in Id., *Scripta minora* I, Roma 1960, p. 347-393).
D. Krömer, *Xenophons Agesilaos. Untersuchungen zur Komposition*, Diss. Augsburg 1971.
W. Kroll, art. *Klearchos* (11), in *RE* 11,1 (1921), col. 580-583.
F. Lasserre, *Le Barbare, le Grec et la Science selon Philippe d'Oponte*, in *MH* 40 (1983), p. 169-177 (= 1983a).
F. Lasserre, *Hermodore de Syracuse dans PHerc. 1021 et 164?*, in *CErc* 13 (1983), p. 63-74 (= 1983b).
T. Lenschau, art. *Klearchos* (4), in *RE* 11,1 (1921), col. 577-579.
J. Martin, *Symposion. Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form*, Paderborn 1931 (= New York 1968).
B. Meissner, *Historiker zwischen Polis und Königshof. Studien zur Stellung der Geschichtsschreiber in der griechischen Gesellschaft in spätklassischer und frühhellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1992.
P. Merlan, *Zur Biographie des Speusippos*, in *Philologus* 103 (1959), p. 198-214 (= *Kleine philosophische Schriften*, Hildesheim - New York 1976, p. 127-143).
F. Münzer, art. *Licinius* (57), in *RE* 13,1 (1926), col. 269-270.
F. Novotný, *The Posthumous Life of Plato*, Praha 1977.
C.B.R. Pelling, art. *Clearchus* (3), in *OCD* (1996³), p. 343.
O. Reverdin, *La religion de la cité platonicienne*, Paris 1945.
C. Ritter, *Platonica*, in *Philologus* 68 (1909), p. 332-343.

K.-P. Schmutzler, *Die Platon-Biografie in der Schrift des Apuleius De Platone et eius dogmate*, Diss. Kiel 1974.
E. Schwartz, art. *Anaxilaides*, in *RE* 1,2 (1894), col. 2083.
J. Stenzel, art. *Speusippos* (2), in *RE* 3A,2 (1929), col. 1636-1669.
A. Swift Riginos, *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden 1976.
F. Taeger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes* I, Stuttgart 1957.
L. Tarán, art. *Anaxilaus of Larissa*, in C.C. Gillispie (ed.), *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, I (1970), p. 150.
R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge - New York - New Rochelle - Melbourne - Sydney 1989.
K. Trampedach, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994.
K. von Fritz, art. *Timolaos* (1), in *RE* 6 A,1 (1936), col. 1273.
D. Whitehead, *Xenocrates the Metic*, in *RhM* 124 (1981), p. 223-244 (esp. p. 225-232).
A. Wörle, *Die politische Tätigkeit der Schüler Platons*, Darmstadt 1981.
E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, II 1. *Sokrates und die Sokratiker-Plato und die Alte Akademie*. Im Anhang *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Platonforschung*, von E. Hoffmann, Leipzig 1922^5 (= Darmstadt 1963).

1010. Xenokrates of Chalkedon

(396/5–314/3 B.C.)

T

1 (F 2 Isnardi Parente) Diog. Laert. 4,14: Διεδέξατο δὲ (*sc.* ὁ Ξενοκράτης) Σπεύσιππον (T 7 Tarán) καὶ ἀφηγήσατο τῆς σχολῆς πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου ἀρξάμενος κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς δεκάτης καὶ ἑκατοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος. Ἐτελεύτα δὲ νυκτὸς λεκάνῃ προσπταίσας, ἔτος ἤδη γεγονὼς δεύτερον καὶ ὀγδοηκοστόν.

2 (F 53 Heinze = F 264 Isnardi Parente) Simpl. *In Arist. Phys.* 8,1 (251 b 19), p. 1165, l. 33-38 Diels: (...) Ξενοκράτης (...) ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου τάδε γεγραφώς (...) (cf. F 1a-c).

F

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΒΙΟΥ

1a (F 53 Heinze = F 264 Isnardi Parente) Simpl. *In Arist. Phys.* 8,1 (251 b 19), p. 1165, l. 33-38 Diels: Ἔτι δὲ τοῦτο σαφέστερον πεποίηκε Ξενοκράτης ὁ γνησιώτατος τῶν Πλάτωνος ἀκροατῶν ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου τάδε γεγραφώς· "Τὰ μὲν οὖν ζῷα πάλιν οὕτω διῃρεῖτο (*sc.* ὁ Πλάτων) εἰς ἰδέας τε καὶ μέρη πάντα τρόπον διαιρῶν, ἕως εἰς τὰ πάντων στοιχεῖα ἀφίκετο τῶν ζῴων, ἃ δὴ πέντε σχήματα καὶ σώματα ὠνόμαζεν, εἰς αἰθέρα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν καὶ ἀέρα".
1b (F 53 Heinze = F 265 Isnardi Parente) Simpl. *In Arist. De Caelo* 1,2 (268 b 17), p. 12, l. 21-26 Heiberg: Καὶ ὅτι καὶ Πλάτων πέντε εἶναι τὰ ἁπλᾶ σώματα νομίζει κατὰ τὰ πέντε σχήματα, ἀρκεῖ Ξενοκράτης ὁ γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀκροατῶν ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου τάδε γράφων· "Τὰ μὲν οὖν ζῷα οὕτω διῃρεῖτο (*sc.* ὁ Πλάτων) εἰς ἰδέας τε καὶ μέρη πάντα τρόπον διαιρῶν, ἕως εἰς τὰ πέντε στοιχεῖα ἀφίκετο τῶν

3 Λυσιμαχίδου *BFa. corr.* : λυσιμάχου *Fp. corr. P* **4** προσπταίσας a : π. χαλκῇ φ **18-19** ὁ γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ : ὁ φυσικώτατος αὐτοῦ και D

1010. Xenokrates of Chalkedon
(396/5–314/3 B.C.)

T

1 He (*sc.* Xenokrates) succeeded Speusippos and led the school for twenty-five years from the second year of the 110th Olympiad (339/8 B.C.), when Lysimachides was archon. He died by falling over a dish at night-time, at the age of eighty-two.

2 (...) Xenokrates (...) having written the following in his work *On the Life of Plato* (...).

F

ON THE LIFE OF PLATO

1a This has been made even clearer by Xenokrates, the most genuine of Plato's pupils, who wrote the following in his work *On the Life of Plato*: "Accordingly, he (*sc.* Plato) again divided living beings into classes and species, dividing them all systematically, until he arrived at the elements of all living beings, which he called five figures and bodies: ether, fire, water, earth and air". **1b** And that Plato too believes that there are five simple bodies, corresponding to the five figures, is made clear enough by Xenokrates, the most genuine of his pupils, who writes the following in his work *On the Life of Plato*: "Accordingly, he (*sc.* Plato) again divided living beings into classes and species,

ζῴων, ἃ δὴ πέντε σχήματα καὶ σώματα ὠνόμαζεν, εἰς αἰθέρα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν καὶ ἀέρα". **1c** (F 53 HEINZE = F 266 ISNARDI PARENTE) SIMPL. *In Arist. De caelo* 1,3 (270 a 9), p. 87, l. 20-26 HEIBERG: Καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ Ξενοκράτους περὶ τούτων ἱστορηθέντων, ὧν οὐδὲν ἂν εἴη χεῖρον καὶ νῦν ὑπομνῆσαι, ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου γεγραμμένοις ὧδε· "Τὰ μὲν οὖν ζῷα πάλιν οὕτως διῃρεῖτο (*sc.* ὁ Πλάτων) εἰς ἰδέας τε καὶ μέρη πάντα τρόπον διαιρῶν, ἕως εἰς τὰ πάντων στοιχεῖα ἀφίκετο τῶν ζῴων, ἃ δὴ πέντε σχήματα καὶ σώματα ὠνόμαζεν, εἰς αἰθέρα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν καὶ ἀέρα."

dividing them all systematically, until he arrived at the elements of all living beings, which he called five figures and bodies: ether, fire, water, earth and air". **1c** And indeed (one can infer this) also from what Xenokrates relates about these things, which it is worthwhile recalling at this point, as he writes the following in his work *On the Life of Plato*: "Accordingly, he (*sc*. Plato) again divided living beings into classes and species, dividing them all systematically, until he arrived at the elements of all living beings, which he called five figures and bodies: ether, fire, water, earth and air".

1010. Xenokrates of Chalkedon

(396/5–314/3 B.C.)

T

(1) From this passage we can deduce the dates of X.'s birth and death. Since X. took up the scholarchate of the Academy in 339/8 and held this position for twenty-five years until his death, he must have died in 314/3. According to Diogenes' information, X. attained the age of eighty-two, which brings us to the year 396/5 for his birth. In regard to the succession of Speusippos (*FGrHist* IV 1009) by X., we are faced with two problems[1]. Firstly, there is a gap between Speusippos' death in 340/39 and X.'s assumption of the scholarchate in 339/8. Does this indicate a period of 'anarchy', maybe due to rivalry between the candidates for the headship of the Academy[2]? This immediately leads to the second problem. There are two major traditions concerning the way in which X. became head of the Platonic school[3]. According to Diogenes Laertios[4], Speusippos, who suffered from paralysis, sent for X. requesting him to come and take over the direction of the school. But in Philodemos' *History of the Academy*[5] we

---

[1] For the Academy's legal status at the time of X.'s succession, see WHITEHEAD (1981: 233) and especially ISNARDI PARENTE (1981: 141-149), with references to ealier literature.

[2] Cf. JACOBY (1902: 312-314) and the comm. on *FGrHist* 244 F 344-346; TARÁN (1981: 7; 209-210).

[3] In the Neoplatonic lives of Aristotle (*Vita Marciana* 24; *Vita Vulgata* 18; *Vita Latina* 24 DÜRING) we find a tradition referred to already in CIC. *Acad.* 1,4 (17), namely that both Aristotle and X. succeeded Speusippos, the latter teaching in the Academy and the former in the Lyceum, apparently for organizational reasons. This version would reflect a later tendency to reconcile the philosophies of the Academy and the Peripatos. MERLAN (1946: 109 = 1976: 150), on the other hand, argues that people in those days may have regarded Aristotle and X. as the leaders of one school located in two different buildings, cf. e.g. DILLON (1977: 23).

[4] DIOG. LAERT. 4,3 (= XENOKRATES F 19 ISNARDI PARENTE = SPEUSIPPOS F 2 ISNARDI PARENTE = SPEUSIPPOS T 1 TARÁN): Ἤδη δὲ ὑπὸ παραλύσεως καὶ τὸ σῶμα διέφθαρτο, καὶ πρὸς Ξενοκράτην διεπέμπετο παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ τὴν σχολὴν διαδέξασθαι. Cf. THEM. *Or.* 21,255 b (= SPEUSIPPOS T 11 TARÁN); [GAL.] *Hist. Philos.* 3 (= SPEUSIPPOS T 12 TARÁN), who gives an abbreviated version in which he states that Speusippos appointed X. as his successor; cf. also the two spurious letters from Speusippos to X. (*Epist. Socr.* XXXII and XXXIII ORELLI = SPEUSIPPOS F 157-158 ISNARDI PARENTE, with comm. p. 403-405).

[5] P. HERC. 1021, col. VI, l. 41-col. VII, l. 6 DORANDI: Οἱ δ[ὲ] ν̣εανίσκοι ψηφ[ο]φορή|σαντες ὅστις αὐτῶν ἡγή{σ}|σετα[ι], Ξ̣ενοκράτη[ν] εἵλοντο̣ | τὸν [Κα]λχη̣δ̣όνιον, Ἀρισ̣το(VII)τέλους μ̣ὲν ἀποδεδημη|κότος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, Με|ν̣εδήμου δὲ τοῦ Πυρραίου | καὶ Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ Ἡρακλε|⁵ώ̣του παρ' ὀλίγας ψήφους ἡτ|τηθέντων.

find a detailed report of an election in which X. was chosen by the other members of the school while Aristotle was absent[6] and while his rivals Menedemos and Herakleides were defeated by only a few votes. Some modern scholars try to reconcile both versions[7], assuming that Speusippos summoned X.—who may have been his favorite candidate—because he knew that X. had to be present in Athens in order to be elected leader of the Academy[8]. Others consider the latter tradition, which is the older, to be the only correct one[9].

As to X.'s character, Philodemos[10] stresses the difference between X., who was chosen as scholarch because of his σωφροσύνη or 'self-control'[11], and his predecessor Speusippos, who is said to have had an inclination towards hedonism. X. is also considered to be Plato's most faithful disciple[12] from the personal[13] (and the doxographical[14]) point of view.

As he was one of Plato's pupils from his early youth[15] and the

---

[6] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 5,2-3 (= *FGrHist* 1026 F 33), in which we read only that X. was appointed head of the Academy while Aristotle was away. On the relationship between the texts of Diogenes and Philodemos, see the comm. on *FGrHist* 1026 F 33.

[7] See e.g. MERLAN (1946: 108 = 1976: 149); WHITEHEAD (1981: 233).

[8] If this assumption is correct, we do not know whether Speusippos notified Aristotle too. In any case Philodemos' text seems to imply that Aristotle's absence from Athens—deliberate or not—was the only reason why he was not elected. This means that Aristotle was considered by the Academics to be by far the most valuable candidate; apparently he was not excluded because his philosophy would have been incompatible with that of the Platonic school, cf. MERLAN (1946: 103-107 = 1976: 144-148) and WHITEHEAD (1981: 233).

[9] See e.g. GIGON (1958: 159-161); ISNARDI PARENTE (1980: 205-206; 403) and (1981: 140-141); TARÁN (1981: 183-184).

[10] P. HERC. 1021, col. VII, l. 11-18 DORANDI.

[11] On X.'s σωφροσύνη, see e.g. ISNARDI PARENTE (1981: 131-132) and WHITEHEAD (1981: 242-243).

[12] Cf. the phrase ὁ γνησιώτατος τῶν ἀκροατῶν (F 1a-b).

[13] Cf. e.g. DIOG. LAERT. 4,11 (= F 107 HEINZE = F 2 ISNARDI PARENTE), where X. says to Dionysios, who is threatening to decapitate Plato: "No one will cut off that head before mine", and AEL. *Var. hist.* 3,19 (= F 11 ISNARDI PARENTE), where X. defends Plato against the irreverence of Aristotle, who had expelled the 80 year old philosopher from the Academy's *peripatos*. On the latter story and its ultimate source, cf. e.g. SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 130); ISNARDI PARENTE (1981: 133 with n. 2) and (1982: 283); BURKERT (1993: 18-21).

[14] According to ISNARDI PARENTE (1981: 134 with n. 1), X. was the only Academic who remained loyal to Plato's theory of Ideas and dedicated his whole career to the exegesis of his master's doctrine. However, DILLON (1977: 23), for example, is less affirmative in this respect, when he states that X. took up the task of systematizing Plato's phylosophy, but that while doing so he came to some new conclusions as well. On X.'s opinion about Plato's Ideas, see DILLON (1977: 28-29).

[15] Cf. DIOG. LAERT. 4,6. Like Speusippos he might have accompanied Plato on his third trip to Syracuse; cf. DIOG. LAERT. 4,11; TIM. *ap.* ATHEN. 437b; AEL. *Var. Hist.* 2,41.

Academy's third scholarch, X. was in an ideal position to write an eyewitness account of his master's life. Yet, whether he actually did write a biography, is a question which will be treated in the commentary on F 1a-c.

(2) If the phrase Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου refers to the title of a book, this very item is missing in Diogenes Laertios' list of X.'s works[16]. Cf. the commentary on F 1a-c.

F

ON THE LIFE OF PLATO

(1a-c) Did X. write a biography of Plato? The expression ἐν τῷ / ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος βίου seems to indicate the title of a work. However, it is rather doubtful whether the word βίος was used by X. himself. Possibly the original title was *Περὶ Πλάτωνος*, the element βίος being added by Simplikios or one of his sources.

The fragment under discussion, which deals with the theory of five simple bodies[17], is not biographical in nature. This, however, is in itself no proof that X.'s writing did not contain any biographical elements. As with many other Περὶ-titles, we may conjecture a work containing both biographical and doxographical elements, no biographical fragments of which have come down to us. Unfortunately the scanty evidence provides us with no certain information.

Els Theys

[16] Diog. Laert. 4,11-14 (= F 2 Isnardi Parente).

[17] On the theory of five simple bodies and the question whether Plato himself developed it against the doctrine of four simple bodies (fire, air, water and earth) advanced by the materialists and mentioned in the *Timaeus* and other Platonic dialogues, see e.g. Tarán (1975: 36-42, esp. p. 39-40). Tarán is of the opinion that X. wanted to read Aristotle's doctrine of ether into Plato's *Timaeus*; contrary to e.g. Zeller II 1 (1922^5: 951 with n. 2), who thinks that Plato changed his doctrine at the end of his life.

Text editions

* H. Diels, *Simplicii In Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor posteriores commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 10), Berlin 1895.

* J.L. Heiberg, *Simplicii In Aristotelis quattuor libros De Caelo commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 7), Berlin 1894.

R. Heinze, *Xenokrates. Darstellung der Lehre und Sammlung der Fragmente*, Leipzig 1892.

M. Isnardi Parente, *Senocrate-Ermodoro, Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Platone 3), Napoli 1982.

M. Isnardi Parente, *Speusippo, Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Platone 1), Napoli 1980.

F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente* (Philologische Untersuchungen 16), Berlin 1902.

* H.S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* I (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964 (= 1966).

L. Tarán, *Academica: Plato, Philip of Opus, and the Pseudo-Platonic Epinomis* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 107), Philadelphia 1975.

L. Tarán, *Speusippus of Athens. A Critical Study with a Collection of the Related Texts and Commentary* (Philosophia Antiqua 39), Leiden 1981.

Secondary literature

W. Burkert, *Platon in Nahaufnahme. Ein Buch aus Herculaneum*, Stuttgart - Leipzig 1993.

J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, London 1977.

O. Gigon, *Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten*, in *MH* 15 (1958), p. 147-193.

M. Isnardi Parente, *Per la biografia di Senocrate*, in *RFIC* 109 (1981), p. 129-162.

P. Merlan, *The Successor of Speusippus*, in *TAPhA* 77 (1946), p. 103-111 (= Id., *Kleine philosophiche Schriften*, Hildesheim - New York 1976, p. 144-152).

P. Merlan, *Zur Biographie des Speusippos*, in *Philologus* 103 (1959), p. 198-214.

A. Swift Riginos, *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden 1976.

D. Whitehead, *Xenocrates the Metic*, in *RhM* 124 (1981), p. 223-244.

E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, II 1. *Sokrates und die Sokratiker-Plato und die Alte Akademie. Im Anhang* Der gegenwärtige Stand der Platonforschung, *von E. Hoffmann*, Leipzig 1922[5] (= Darmstadt 1963).

1011. Philippos of Opus

(end 5th (?)-4th cent. B.C.)

T

1a (F VI TARÁN = no. 20 F 14b LASSERRE) DIOG. LAERT. 3,37: Ἔνιοί τε φασὶν ὅτι Φίλιππος ὁ Ὀπούντιος τοὺς Νόμους αὐτοῦ (*sc.* τοῦ Πλάτωνος) μετέγραψεν ὄντας ἐν κηρῷ. Τούτου δὲ καὶ Ἐπινομίδα φασὶν εἶναι. **1b** (F VII TARÁN = no. 20 F 14c LASSERRE) ANON. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* 24,13-19, p. 37 WESTERINK: Ἐσχάτους δὲ τοὺς Νόμους φασὶν γεγράφθαι, διότι ἀδιορθώτους αὐτοὺς κατέλιπεν (*sc.* ὁ Πλάτων) καὶ συγκεχυμένους μὴ εὐπορήσας χρόνου διὰ τὴν τελευτὴν πρὸς τὸ συνθεῖναι αὐτούς. Εἰ δὲ καὶ νῦν δοκοῦσι συντετάχθαι κατὰ τὸ δέον, οὐκ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πλάτωνος συνθέντος ἀλλά τινος Φιλίππου Ὀπουντίου, ὃς διάδοχος γέγονε τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ διδασκαλείου.

2 (F I TARÁN = no. 20 T 1 LASSERRE) *Suda* Φ 418 *s.v.* Φιλόσοφος· ὃς τοὺς Πλάτωνος Νόμους διεῖλεν εἰς βιβλία ιβ', τὸ γὰρ ιγ' αὐτὸς προσθεῖναι λέγεται. Καὶ ἦν Σωκράτους καὶ αὐτοῦ Πλάτωνος ἀκουστής, σχολάσας τοῖς μετεώροις. Ὧν δὲ κατὰ Φίλιππον τὸν Μακεδόνα συνεγράψατο τάδε· (...) Περὶ Πλάτωνος (...).

F

ΠΕΡΙ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ

1 (F V TARÁN = no. 20 F 14a LASSERRE) P. HERC. 1021, col. III, l. 35 - col. V, l. 19 DORANDI: |[35] ΛΕ. [. Φίλιππος ὁ φ]ι[λό]|σ[οφος ἀσ]τρολόγος [τ' ἐ]ξηγεῖ|τ' αὐτῶι γεγονὼς ἀναγρα|φẹὺς τοῦ Πλάτωνọς καὶ ἀ|κουστής, ὅτι "γεγηρακὼς |[40] ἤδη Π̣λάτων ξέν[ον] ὑπε|δέξ[ατ]ο Χαλδα[ῖο]ṇ Ε.|[.....] `ṭιναṣ́ [............] ἐπύρεξẹ[ν. Ἐκεῖ] (V) ν[ο]ς δ' ὑπὸ Θ̣ράιττης ἔγ γε | μέλọς

18 ὁ φ]ι[λό]|σ[οφος *Gaiser* : ὁ Μεδ]μα[ῖ]ọ[ς *temptanter Lasserre* **20** ἐπ̣[ῳδάς] *Gaiser* : ἐπ̣[ὶ λόγους] *Lasserre* **21** [ἐπάιδοντα, ὅτι] *Gaiser* : [Εἶτα δὲ μικρὸν] *Lasserre* **21** Ἐκεῖ]ν[ο]ς *Gaiser* : αὐλούμε]ν[ο]ς *Lasserre*

1011. Philippos of Opus
(end 5th (?)-4th cent. B.C.)

T

1a Some say that Philippos of Opus copied his (*sc*. Plato's) *Laws*, which were left on waxen writing tablets. They also state that the *Epinomis* is his work. **1b** They say that the *Laws* were written last, since he (*sc*. Plato) left them uncorrected and in disorder, lacking time—because of his decease—for their final editing. And if they make a well-edited impression today, it is not because Plato has arranged them, but a certain Philippos of Opus, who became his successor in the Platonic school.

2 Philosopher [*sic*], who divided Plato's *Laws* in twelve books, since it is said that he added the thirteenth himself. He was the disciple of Sokrates and of Plato himself, devoting his time to the study of astronomical phenomena. Living in the days of Philip of Macedon, he wrote the following works: (...) *On Plato* (...).

F

ON PLATO

1 ... Philippos the philosopher and astronomer, who had been Plato's secretary and disciple, told him: "When Plato already was an old man, he received as a guest a Chaldaean ... (Plato) had fever. He (*sc*. the Chaldae-

ἥρ<μ>οττε δάκτυλ⟦ωι⟧ `ον ´ | ἐνδιδοὺ[ς] ῥ̣υθ̣μόν. Αὐτόθι | δ’ ὡς πα[ρ]αφρονο[ί]η τε φωνεῖν |[5] τὸν Πλάτ̣ωνα καὶ ἐπερωτῆ|σαι, τοῦ δ’ εἰπόντος· ‘Ἐννο|εῖς ὡς πάντηι τὸ βάρβαρον | ἀμα̣[θ]ές· ἅ̣τε γε
παράρυθμον | οὗ[ς γ]ῆ̣ βάρβαρος φέρουσα |[10] Τ[..
..]ΕΙΑΣ [ ] ἀδυνατεῖ μα|[θεῖν]’,
ἡ̣σ̣θῆναι μεγάλως καὶ | ἐν ε[ὐ]δίαι μεγάληι τὸν ἄν|δρα [..] ΟΜΥΤΕΙΝ ἐπ̣[εὶ κ]αὶ ταῦ|τ' ἐπὶ νοῦν ἤρχετ̣' [α]ὐτῶι καὶ |[15] [π]ροάγει. Διαθερμαν̣θέν̣|τος δὲ̣ [μ]ᾶλλον ἔκ τ[ι]νος ἐ|γέρσεως νύκτωρ ἀ[κ]αιρ[ό]|τερον̣ [γε]νομέν[ης] ΕΠΕΙ[...]|ΚΥΟΝ̣[.].[....]..[

---

22 ἔγ γε μέλο̣ς ἥρ<μ>οττε δάκτυλον *Mekler et Gaiser* : ἔγ γε μέλ[ει] ἔκ̣ρου̣σ̣ε δακτυλ̣ι̣κ̣[ὸν] *Lasserre* **23** πα[ρ]αφρονο[ί]η *Mekler-Gaiser-Lasserre* : ῥ̣υθ̣μόν *Mekler et Praechter* **25** οὗ[ς γ]ῆ̣ *Gaiser* : φύ[σις] *Gomperz et Mekler* : οὕ[τω]ς *Lasserre* **26** τ[ὰς πν]ο̣ιὰς *Wilamowitz et Mekler* : τ[ὰς πν]οὰς *Lasserre* : π̣ω[ς φο]ρ̣ὰς *Gaiser* **27** [εὐ]φημ̣εῖν *Gaiser* : [π]οπ<π>ύζειν *Buecheler-Mekler-Lasserre* **28** [π]ροάγει *Gaiser* : εὐπράγει *Buecheler* : ἀκροάσει? *Mekler* : [διε]κ̣ράτ̣ει *Lasserre* **30** ἀ[κ]αιρ[ό]τερον̣ [γε]νομέν[ης] *Gaiser* : ὑ̣[πνωτικω]τέρο[υ γε]νομέν[ου *Mekler* : ψ[υ]χρ[ο]τέρου γε]νομέν[ου *Lasserre* **30** ἐπει[θ' ἐλ]κύον[τ̣]ο̣[ς αὐτο̣ῦ̣ μόγις τὸν] ἀ[έρα, κατέλιπεν ἡ ψυχὴ τ]ὸ σ̣[ῶ]μα.” Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἠβο]ύλ̣[ετο Νεάνθης. *Gaiser* : ἐπει[σ]ή̣χθησ[αν π]ί̣ν̣[ακες *Lasserre*

an), accompanied by a Thracian female slave, wanted to strike up a song, indicating a dactylic rhythm. Immediately Plato shouted that he/she was out of his/her mind and asked him (*sc.* the Chaldaean) (for an explanation) and when he answered 'You notice that the barbarian creature is completely ignorant because

unrhythmical is the ear of the barbarian land,
(so that) it is unable to learn ...',

Plato was very amused and, having regained his full composure, he [congratulated?] the man because this (verse) had come into his mind and he had pronounced it. After a worse fever had come upon him because of an awkward awakening during the night ...".

1011. Philippos of Opus

(end 5th (?)-4th cent. B.C.)

T

(1-2) In the ancient sources P. is referred to under very different names[1]. From the contents of the *Suda*-article Φιλόσοφος (T 2) it is clear that this 'anonymous' philosopher must also be identified with P. In regard to the question as to why the philosopher's name is missing in the lemma, there are two plausible answers[2]. P.'s name might have been left out before the word Φιλόσοφος, an understandable omission seeing that both words have the same initial syllable. In this case the mistake must be due to the lexicographer's own source, since in the *Suda* the Φιλόσοφος-article occurs in the correct alphabetical order[3]. Another possible answer is that the author of the Φιλόσοφος-lemma or his source misunderstood the abbreviation ΦΙΛΟΣ ΟΠΟΣ (= Φίλιππος Ὀπούντιος), used by the epitomist Hesychios of Miletos, on whom the lexicographer ultimately depended[4].

As to dating P., we lack precise information. In the *Suda* (T 2), we read that P. was a pupil of both Sokrates and Plato and lived in the days of King Philip of Macedon. Hence earlier scholars[5] considered him to be a younger contemporary of Plato and situated his birth around 419/8, his death around 340 B.C.[6]. However, as von Fritz[7] pointed out, it is clear from the evidence of Eudemos[8] that P. belonged to the same generation as Eudoxos of Knidos (*FGrHist* 1006)[9], who was born around 400 B.C. Hence it seems impossible that P. was ever a disciple of Plato's own teacher Sokrates, who died in 399 B.C. Again, there appear to be two possible solutions. Either the informa-

---

1 Cf. von Fritz (1938: 2351-2352).

2 For a review of the earlier literature concerning this problem, see Oldfather (1908: 454 n. 138; 458-459).

3 Cf. e.g. von Fritz (1938: 2351) and Lasserre (1987: 593).

4 Cf. e.g. Tarán (1975: 124 n. 518).

5 Cf. e.g. Oldfather (1908: 454-456).

6 This date for his death was deduced from the fact that in P. Herc. 1021, col. VI, l. 41-col. VII, l. 6 Dorandi P. is not listed among Xenokrates' contenders for the scholarchate of the Academy in 339 B.C. Of course, this *argumentum ex silentio* is not completely reliable, since P. did not necessarily have to be a candidate for the leadership of Plato's school.

7 von Fritz (1938: 2353).

8 Eudemos *ap.* Prokl. *In prim. Eucl. Elem. libr.* p. 67-68 Friedlein.

9 On Eudoxos, see e.g. also Lasserre (1966); Trampedach (1994: 57-61); Toomer (1996^3).

tion in the *Suda* is based on a misunderstanding[10], or the Sokrates referred to is Sokrates the Younger. The latter solution was proposed by Lasserre[11], who assumes that P. entered the Academy during Plato's second sojourn in Sicily and had Sokrates the Younger as his teacher until Plato's return[12]. Lasserre places P.'s birth between 385 and 380, which would make him a genuine contemporary of Philip of Macedon.

In regard to the relationship between the testimonia under discussion, Tarán[13] has shown that—at least where P.'s role in the edition of the *Laws* is concerned—the anonymous *Prolegomena* and the *Suda* made inferences[14] from Diogenes Laertios or a similar source, on whom they probably both depend.

It is very difficult to say whether P.'s editorship consisted merely in transcribing Plato's manuscript, which may have been left—at least partly—on waxen writing-tablets[15], or whether he corrected it (and if so, to what degree). Diogenes Laertios uses the verb μεταγράφω, which can have both meanings[16]. The passages in the *Prolegomena* and the *Suda* are not of much assistance either. The author of the *Prolegomena* writes that Plato left the *Laws* uncorrected[17] and in disorder and that if they make a well-edited impression now, this is thanks to P. Yet in all likelihood the author inferred the *Laws*' alleged state of disorder from Diogenes' statement that they were ἐν κηρῷ[18]. Moreover, it is not clear whether he assumed any major intervention by P. besides the arrangement of the work[19]. The author of the Φιλόσοφος-

---

[10] Cf. von Fritz (1938: 2353), who supposes that the lexicographer or his source read Σωκράτους instead of Σωκρατικὸς, and Tarán (1975: 127). As Oldfather (1908: 454-455 n. 139) convincingly demonstrated, Praetorius' emendation of Σωκράτους into Ἐχεκράτους should be dismissed.

[11] Lasserre (1987: 594).

[12] Lasserre (1987: 503-505) gives the same explanation for the equally puzzling notion in the Neoplatonic lives of Aristotle (*Vita Marciana* 5; *Vita Vulgata* 4; *Vita Latina* 5 Düring = no. 4 T 5a-b-c Lasserre) that the Stagirite stayed three years with Sokrates before he turned to Plato.

[13] Tarán (1975: 128-130).

[14] Cf. *infra*.

[15] On the meaning of the phrase ὄντας ἐν κηρῷ, see Zeller II 1 (1922[5]: 979 n.1) and Tarán (1975: 130 n. 542).

[16] See *LSJ s.v.* μεταγράφω: "*copy*, *transcribe*"; "*rewrite*, *alter* or *correct what one has written*".

[17] Cf. Prokl. *ap. Proleg.* 25,6-8 Westerink, where Proklos argues against the authenticity of the *Epinomis*: Πῶς ὁ τοὺς Νόμους μὴ εὐπορήσας διορθώσασθαι διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν χρόνον ζωῆς τὸ Ἐπινόμιον μετὰ τούτους ὃν εἶχεν γράψαι;

[18] Cf. Tarán (1975: 128-129). The Anonymous' statement that P. succeeded Plato as leader of the Academy may be an incorrect inference from P.'s editorship mentioned in Diog. Laert. 3,37 (T 1a) and the eminent place which he occupied in the list of Plato's pupils in Diog. Laert. 3,46.

[19] The verb συντίθημι does not have any connotation of 'correction'.

article in the *Suda* only mentions the division of the *Laws* into twelve books. Leaving aside the fact that this author also seems to have inferred incorrectly that this division was P.'s work[20], his report does not suggest that P. rewrote or corrected the *Laws*. Modern scholars who have examined the internal evidence of the work have come to highly divergent conclusions. In the nineteenth century many scholars were convinced that P. corrected the *Laws* extensively, and they analysed the text thoroughly in order to reconstruct Plato's original work[21]. Later on there was a tendency to consider the *Laws* to be the work of Plato only, mainly on the basis of the argument that the work contains many mistakes which P. could have corrected, if he had wished to do so[22]. Most probably the truth lies somewhere in between. Though P. in all likelihood preserved a lot of things which Plato might have left out or altered during a final revision of his work, he probably made some changes in order to transform the text into a coherent unity[23].

The problem concerning the authorship of the *Epinomis* is possibly even more complicated. According to Diogenes, some stated that the *Epinomis* was P.'s work, and it is obvious that the lexicographer of the *Suda* also thinks of P. as the author of the *Epinomis*, when he writes that 'the philosopher' was said to have added 'the thirteenth book of Plato's *Laws*'[24]. Proklos[25] denies Plato's authorship, but resorts to in-

---

[20] The lexicographer (or his source) probably deduced this from the account of P.'s editorship of the *Laws* and his supposed authorship of the *Epinomis* in Diogenes or a similar source and from the division of the *Laws* into twelve books during his own lifetime. However, since we know that long writings such as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were divided into books by Alexandrian scholars, there is little reason to assume that in this case the task had already been fulfilled by the early Academics; cf. Tarán (1975: 129-130), with references.

[21] For a survey of these authors, see von Fritz (1938: 2359).

[22] Cf. still Stalley (1983: 2-3). The opinion of Tarán (1975: 130 with n. 543 and 544) is not very clear. While in n. 543 he defends the view that P. transcribed the *Laws* without correcting them, in the following note he clarifies his statement that P. in all likelihood prepared the work for publication, by saying that "publication probably meant that a final, *corrected* (my Italics) copy of the work prepared by P. was made available at the Academy".

[23] Cf. Zeller II 1 (1922[5]: 978-982) and von Fritz (1938: 2359-2360).

[24] This subtitle of the *Epinomis* is attested as early as the second cent. A.D.; cf. Tarán (1975: 124).

[25] Prokl. *ap. Proleg.* 25,4-12 Westerink. According to Proklos, Plato cannot be the author of the *Epinomis*, firstly, because he did not even have the time to correct the *Nomoi*, which were written before the *Epinomis* (cf. *supra*, n. 17), and secondly, because in the latter work the planets move from the left to the right, while in the other platonic dialogues they move in the opposite direction.

ternal evidence to prove it[26] and does not mention P. as the real author. Modern scholars are divided on the issue. Some follow the ancient sources, rejecting Plato's authorship and considering P. as the author of the *Epinomis*[27]. Others assign the work to Plato. They reject the testimony of Diogenes because he fails to cite his sources and the arguments contained therein[28], and that of Proklos because his arguments cut no ice[29]. Both sides appeal to internal evidence for their stand. However, as von Fritz remarked as far back as 1938[30], our present state of knowledge does not enable us to settle the question. If Plato did not write the *Epinomis*, the author may have been P. or even another member of the early Academy[31]. We may never know for certain the correct answer to this question.

Among the writings which the *Suda* (T 2) attributes to P., there is a work called *Περὶ Πλάτωνος*. On the question whether this work was biographical in nature, see the comm. on F 1.

F

ON PLATO

(1) Although P.'s name is emended in l. 35, we can be quite certain that it is he who is meant; firstly, because he was an astronomer and one of Plato's pupils (cf. T 2), and secondly, because the term ἀναγραφεὺς probably refers to P.'s activity as editor of the *Laws*[32].

As to the origin of the passage, Oldfather[33] spontaneously took it to be a fragment of P.'s *Περὶ Πλάτωνος*. However, as von Fritz[34] pointed

---

[26] Some scholars regard this as an indication that if Proklos knew the tradition related by Diogenes and the *Suda*, he did not find it trustworthy enough to go on; cf. Taylor (1929: 1); von Fritz (1938: 2360).

[27] See e.g. Müller (1927); Dönt (1967).

[28] Cf. e.g. Taylor (1929: 1); Novotný (1960: 15).

[29] Cf. e.g. Novotný (1960: 15-16).

[30] von Fritz (1938: 2366).

[31] The authorship of the *Epinomis* may have been attributed to P. just because he was known as the editor of the *Laws*; cf. von Fritz (1938: 2360); Tarán (1975: 133). However, on the basis of a comparison between the topics in the *Epinomis* and the titles of P.'s writings and the scanty evidence for them, Tarán (1975: 133-138), who excludes Plato as author, thinks it probable that P. was indeed the author of the *Epinomis*.

[32] Cf. Mekler (1902: XXVII); Oldfather (1908: 456 with n. 144); Tarán (1975: 124-125; 132-133); Lasserre (1983b: 63); Gaiser (1988: 108; 428). On P.'s editorship of the *Laws*, cf. *supra*, comm. on T 1-2.

[33] See e.g. Oldfather (1908: 456 n. 144).

[34] von Fritz (1938: 2354); cf. Tarán (1975: 133).

out, the phrase ἐξηγεῖτ' αὐτῷ seems to indicate an oral report or a dialogue, which would exclude direct use of P.'s work. Of course, it is also thinkable that what is presented as an oral tradition in reality comes from P.'s *Περὶ Πλάτωνος*[35] or that the content of P.'s oral account was also to be found somewhere in his work on Plato; but this we cannot ascertain[36].

Like many other works with a Περὶ-title, this *Περὶ Πλάτωνος* may have contained biographical as well as doxographical elements[37]. If the content of the present fragment somehow corresponds with a passage of P.'s work on Plato, this would illustrate the biographical flavour of the work[38]. Yet, as mentioned above, we have no firm evidence that this is the case.

On which intermediary source, referred to in l. 37 with the pronoun αὐτῷ, depended Philodemos, the author of the work preserved on P. Herc. 1021? According to Lasserre this source was Hermodoros (*FGrHist* 1008), an author for whom a work called *Περὶ Πλάτωνος* is attested and whom Lasserre considers to be Philodemos' main source for his account of Plato[39]. This scholar tries to make his case with a number of arguments which depend mainly on Mekler's reconstruction of P. Herc. 1021. However, since Gaiser and Dorandi's reexamination of the papyrus in question, Lasserre's source analysis has lost its foundation[40]. On the basis of his new reconstruction of the text, Gaiser considers Neanthes of Kyzikos (*FGrHist* 1032) to be Philodemos' direct source[41].

---

35 This is the opinion of Lasserre (1987: 604-605). However, the arguments which this scholar adduces to demonstrate that the fragment under discussion must be from P.'s *Περὶ Πλάτωνος*, do not seem compelling.

36 Cf. Gaiser (1988: 109; 428-429).

37 Besides the account of Plato's last night, Lasserre (1987: no. 20 F 15-23) attributes to P.'s *Περὶ Πλάτωνος* a lot of other fragments about the evolution of mathematics. However, there is a reference to the *Περὶ Πλάτωνος* in any of these passages and the attribution seems to be based on a rather uncertain relationship between Lasserre's F 16-23 and F 15a-b, a fragment which is traditionally assigned to Eudemos of Rhodes; cf. Gaiser (1988: 90-91; 347).

38 Some scholars, e.g. Swift riginos (1976: 5) and Gaiser (1988: 109), call the *Περὶ Πλάτωνος* a biographical work. However, they fail to adduce any arguments in support of this interpretation. Moreover, it seems rather improbable that we can speak of genuine biography at this early period.

39 Lasserre (1983b: 63-67) and (1987: 601-605; 668-669).

40 Cf. Gaiser (1988: 89-91; 103-104).

41 See Gaiser (1988: 108-109); cf. Burkert (1993b: 34).

As far as the interpretation of the present fragment is concerned, everything depends on how the text is edited. Lasserre follows Mekler's edition with some adjustments of his own. The Swiss scholar subdivides the fragment into three components. First of all, there is said to be a conversation between the old Plato and a Chaldaean, a conversation which was not reproduced by Philodemos, but which in Lasserre's opinion dealt with astronomy[42]. The second episode dealt with a female Thracian flute-player who has to strike up a song in the calming dactylic rhythm in order to attenuate Plato's fever, but who misses the right rhythm and gets reprimanded by Plato[43]. According to Lasserre it is P., who then pronounces the aphorism that "the barbarian creature is ignorant in everything"[44], a phrase which would not only refer to the poor performance of the Thracian flute-player, but also to the incompetence of the Chaldaean during the previous conversation on astronomy[45]. The last part of the fragment treated of Plato's very last moments. After a feverish sleep Plato wakes up during the night and feeling better, he asks someone to bring him writing-tablets. According to Lasserre, P. was referring in this passage to the composition of the *Epinomis*. Plato's pupil is said to have tried to demonstrate the authenticity of the work, while in reality he had written it himself[46]. In our opinion, the composition of the *Laws* could equally have been meant, that is if Lasserre's proposed reading of l. 15-19 (Διαθερμανθέντος δὲ μᾶλλον, ἔκ [δέ] τινος ἐγέρσεως νύκτωρ ψ[υ]χρ[ο]τέροụ [γε]νομέν[ου], ἐπει[σ]ή̣χ̣θη̣σ[αν π]ị̣ν̣[ακες...) would have been well founded. His reconstruction is based on Cic. *Cato* 5,13 (= no. 20 F 14d LASSERRE), where it is stated that Plato died 'while writing'. However, Cicero's assertion does not necessarily have to be taken literally, indicating that Plato actually died at his writing-desk[47], and, what is more important, Gaiser and Dorandi reject the emendation on papyrological grounds[48].

---

[42] See LASSERRE (1983a: 172-173) and (1987: 607-608).

[43] LASSERRE (1983a: 173-174) and (1987: 608-609) assumes that the choice of a Thracian flute-player is not accidental. In his opinion it is an allusion to the heurematographical tradition according to which music was invented by the Thracians, astronomy by the Chaldaeans, geometry by the Egyptians and arithmetic by the Phoenicians. Lasserre therefore concludes that reflection on this mathematical *quadrivium* must have constituted an important part of P.'s *Περὶ Πλάτωνος*.

[44] BURKERT (1993b: 35) is of the same opinion. However, cf. *infra*, n. 56.

[45] Cf. LASSERRE (1983a: 172-173) and (1987: 608).

[46] Cf. LASSERRE (1983a: 173); in (1987: 609-610) it is not so clear whom the scholar considers to be the real author of the *Epinomis*. On the authorship of the *Epinomis*, cf. the comm. on T 1-2.

[47] Cf. NOVOTNÝ (1977: 226).

[48] See GAISER (1988: 421); DORANDI (1991: 222).

In Gaiser's opinion, the whole fragment consists of Plato's final conversation, which he held with a Chaldaean and which—according to this scholar—dealt with the significance of rhythm. Yet, Gaiser sees two possible ways to interpret the text. The conversation resulted from a mistake in rhythm, made either by the Thracian flute-player or by the Chaldaean himself. If the flute-player lost her rhythm, the dactyls would provide the correct rhythm; Plato's remark was directed against her; the Chaldaean's answer referred especially to the Thracian girl, and Plato's joy was caused by the general meaning of the quotation, namely that Greeks are superior to barbarians. If, on the other hand, the mistake was due to the Chaldaean, then the dactyls were the wrong rhythm; Plato addressed the comment to his guest; the answer of the Chaldaean alluded to his own person and Plato was pleased in the first place by the man's self-knowledge. Mainly for linguistic reasons Gaiser prefers the interpretation in which the Chaldaean is responsable for the mistake[49]. Proklos[50] claims that dactylic rhythm tranquillizes the soul. But according to Gaiser, an explanation of Plato's reaction could be that he did not find the *dactylos* calming enough, maybe because—as a result of the short notes—that rhythm is still more exciting than e.g. the *spondeos*, which consists of long notes only[51]. Gaiser is of the opinion that Plato and his oriental guest agreed upon the fact that Greeks have a better sense of rhythm than barbarians. That the notion of rhythm should be understood in a wider sense than just the musical one, is said to be proven by the Chaldaean's answer that barbarians are ignorant in every respect[52]. The point of the story would then be that, while admitting the barbarians' inferiority compared to the Greeks, the Chaldaean showed his own familiarity with Greek culture by quoting

---

[49] See Gaiser (1988: 424). His first argument is the most important: in col. V, l. 1-3, where the reason for Plato's outburst is given, the Chaldaean is the subject of the sentence. Since the emphasis lies on his actions, one might expect that they had caused Plato's irritation. Gaiser's other arguments are less convincing. In his view it is hard to understand why Plato responded to the Thracian's mistake after the Chaldaean had already corrected it. But, in our opinion, the mistake may have occurred after the Chaldaean had indicated the rhythm, in which case Plato's remark immediately followed the mistake. Also Gaiser's last observation, namely that Plato's joy would have been rather unmotivated if the Chaldaean had not made the mistake, seems rather specious.

[50] Prokl. *In Plat. Remp.* I, p. 61 Kroll: Ἐκ δὲ ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελεῖσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν ἅμα μὲν εὐκίνητον, ἅμα δὲ ἠρεμαίαν.

[51] See Gaiser (1988: 432-434).

[52] See Gaiser (1988: 429).

some verses from a Greek tragedy[53]. Plato would have been very pleased with the Chaldaean's answer for three reasons. Firstly, because the man demonstrated remarkable alertness and astonishing knowledge of Greek literature; secondly, because he was aware of the limits of his knowledge, and finally, because the self-knowledge of this Chaldaean proved that in the end the way to philosophy is open to barbarians as well[54].

Burkert, who claims to confine himself to the preserved parts of the text, interprets the fragment in yet another way[55]. In his view Plato was laid up with a fever in a room next to the one where his guest, the Chaldaean, was sitting, while the Thracian girl played a song in dactylic rhythm. When Plato shouted that he/she was out of his/her mind, the Chaldaean or P.[56] would have said that the barbarian creature was completely ignorant. Plato would have been very amused by these words and being in a good mood, he would have blown his nose and then felt better. But after he had got a fresh bout of fever, because of waking up during the night, Plato died. Burkert is of the opinion that the apparent banality of the story pleads for the authenticity of the text, even though Plato's last joy, caused by a joke about the barbarians' inferiority, would have suited P. very well, considering what he wrote in the *Epinomis*[57]. According to Burkert, the scene of the old Plato laid up with a fever, shouting from his sickbed, blowing his nose and feeling relieved by doing so, could not be the result of speculation. However, the scholar's interpretation is based on a dubious emendation[58], and whether these trivialities lend credibility to the story remains a matter of subjective judgment.

In conclusion we may say that the fragmentary state of the text does not make it possible to interpret this passage with the degree of

---

[53] See GAISER (1988: 430). For his reasons for thinking that col. V, l. 8-11 are derived from a tragedy, presumably by Euripides, see GAISER (1988: 431-432). Unfortunately, these verses do not belong to any tragedy that has come down to us.

[54] See GAISER (1988: 430).

[55] See BURKERT (1993a: 91-92) and (1993b: 34-36).

[56] In (1993a: 92), Burkert was inclined to think it was the Chaldaean who said these words, in (1993b: 35) he thought it was P. himself.

[57] *Epinomis* 987 e: ὅτιπερ ἂν Ἕλληνες βαρβάρων παραλάβωσι, κάλλιον τοῦτο εἰς τέλος ἀπεργάζονται (Whatever Greeks receive from barbarians, they improve and carry to perfection). The connection between the fragment under consideration and the *Epinomis* was already noted and discussed at length by LASSERRE (1983a) and (1987: 604-605; 607-608); cf. GAISER (1988: 430). On the authorship of the *Epinomis*, cf. *supra*, comm. on T 1-2.

[58] BURKERT (1993a: 92 n. 28) and (1993b: 35) proposes to emend [..] ΟΜΥΤΕΙΝ on col. V, l. 13 as ἀπομύττειν. However, this verb means '*to blow one's nose*' in the medial voice, while the verb in the papyrus is active and moreover written with one τ.

certainty that would be desirable and that it is therefore impossible to ascertain whether Philodemos' version of Plato's death corresponded to the truth or not[59].

According to some scholars we may find echoes of the Chaldaean's visit in the testimonies of some later authors. In the anonymous *Prolegomena* we read that *Magi* came to Athens in order to "participate in Plato's philosophy"[60]. Seneca[61] speaks of some *Magi*, who happened to be in Athens at the time of Plato's death. These *Magi* made a sacrifice to the philosopher, convinced that he was more than human because he had completed exactly 81 years of life. According to them, 81 was the most perfect number, being nine squared[62]. Another passage that may be connected with the fragment under discussion, is a report by Favorinos, preserved in Diogenes Laertios[63]. There it is stated that the Persian Mithradates had a statue of Plato erected in the Academy, bearing the following inscription: "Mithradates, son of Orontobates, Persian, has dedicated to the Muses this statue of Plato,

---

[59] Gaiser (1983: 58) and Burkert (1993a: 92); (1993b: 36) are convinced that Philodemos' version was the right one. According to Lasserre (1987: 610), there were several stories in circulation for want of one irrefutable testimony. For other versions of Plato's death, see Swift Riginos (1976: 194-198, anecdotes 143-148).

[60] See Anon. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* 6,23-27 Westerink; cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 190-191, anecdote 141); Dörrie (1990: Baustein 68.4b). In this passage Dörrie (1990: 478-479) senses the flavour of an early ἐγκώμιον on Plato. The author tries to demonstrate Plato's superiority over Pythagoras, who went to Persia to learn from the *Magi*, while *Magi* came to Athens to study under Plato. Dörrie therefore suggests that the report may go back to Speusippos (*FGrHist* IV 1009) or Klearchos (*FGrHist* IV 1021), who both wrote about Plato in laudatory terms. On the question of the respective titles of these authors' works, cf. the comm. on *FGrHist* IV 1009 F 1a-b.

[61] Sen. m. *Epist. mor.* 58,31.

[62] On the anecdote of Plato dying at the age of 81 and on the numerological significance of this age, see Swift Riginos (1976: 25-27, anecdote 7); Dörrie (1990: Baustein 60). According to Anon. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* 6,1-9 Westerink, Plato's age at death proved his Apollonian nature: firstly, because 81 is the square of 9, the number of the Muses, who were Apollo's handmaidens, and secondly, because the number is a δυναμοδύναμις, being composed of $(3^2)^2$. However, Kingsley (1995: 196-197) is of the opinion that this association with Apollo was only a secondary one, influenced by other accounts that viewed Plato in Apollonian terms, while in Zoroastrian religion multiples of three were of paramount importance; cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 27). Nevertheless, the special significance of Plato's death at the age of 81 must have constituted an element in the early tradition about this person; hence some scholars consider Speusippos (*FGrHist* IV 1009) to have been a possible source of Seneca and the anonymous *Prolegomena.*; cf. e.g. Boyancé (1936: 254-255); Lasserre (1987: 610-611); Dörrie (1990: 421).

[63] Favorinos *ap.* Diog. Laert. 3,25 (= Favorinos F 5 Mensching — F 36 Barigazzi).

made by Silanion"[64]. Several scholars[65] hold the view that this Mithradates might be one of the *Magi* mentioned in Seneca and the anonymous *Prolegomena*. Some authors even suggest that 'the Persian' and 'the Chaldaean' are one and the same person[66], which is not impossible, given that as from the fifth century B.C. Greeks often used the terms *Magi* and Chaldaeans as synonyms[67]. If the Persian in Diogenes Laertios can be identified with (one of) the *Magi* in Seneca and the anonymous life of Plato, then the offering mentioned by Seneca would be Plato's statue in the Academy[68]. According to some scholars[69], the erection of this effigy demonstrates the efforts of Plato's pupils to found a cult for their deceased teacher. An indication in that direction would, then, be the anecdote, given in the anonymous *Prolegomena*[70], of a woman[71], who asked the oracle of Delphi whether she should rank Plato's στήλη with the statues of the gods[72]. The answer was that she would do well to honour Plato, and that by doing so, she would obtain grace from the blessed ones, among whom this man was counted. From an inscription dating from the first half of the second century B.C., we know that the decisive moment of making

---

[64] On this statue, see MENSCHING (1963: 71-72); GAISER (1982: 97-100) and (1988: 376-377; 435). For a long time archaeologists did not agree about the chronology of the statue, which must have served as a model for the more than 20 preserved images of Plato. However, from P. HERC. 1021, col. II, l. 11-31, a Philochoros-text in which Plato is said to have refused a statue with his own image, Gaiser infers that Silanion's statue must date from after Plato's death.

[65] See e.g. BIDEZ (1945: 2-3); KINGSLEY (1995: 198).

[66] See e.g. GAISER (1988: 377; 435); DÖRRIE (1990: 421-422); KINGSLEY (1995: 200). The conjecture of BOYANCÉ (1936: 255-256) that the Chaldaean can be identified with the stranger mentioned in Aristotle's eulogy of Eudemos, who is said to have erected an altar to Plato, is rejected by MENSCHING (1963: 73 n. 63) and GAISER (1988: 435). According to the latter scholar, it was Eudemos himself who raised the altar.

[67] Cf. e.g. BOYANCÉ (1936: 254); GAISER (1988: 436); KINGSLEY (1995: 200-202).

[68] Cf. GAISER (1988: 436).

[69] See e.g. BOYANCÉ (1936: 272-274); MENSCHING (1963: 72); GAISER (1988: 436); cf. KINGSLEY (1995: 198).

[70] ANON. *Proleg. in Plat. philos.* 6,8-13 WESTERINK; cf. SWIFT RIGINOS (1976: 27, anecdote 8).

[71] According to BOYANCÉ (1936: 273), this woman can be identified as Axiothea of Phleios, one of Plato's two female disciples, who was said to dress in men's clothes; cf. DIOG. LAERT. 3,46.

[72] In this context the word στήλη could be translated as '*gravestone*' or '*monument*'; cf. *LSJ s.v.* στήλη II. According to KINGSLEY (1995: 198), the στήλη of Plato, which is "explicitly compared with 'statues' of the gods, can only refer to the 'statue' (ἀνδριάς) of Plato or—in Mithradates's own words—the 'image' of him (εἰκών) which the Persian had erected in the Academy".

someone a hero came when an image of the person in question was set up close to the statue of a deity[73].

Many scholars see a connection between the fragment under consideration and the orientalizing tendency in the Academy of that age[74]. However, as Kingsley convincingly argued, there is no reason to assume that only this 'Chaldaean' was responsable for the eastern influences on Plato and his school[75].

There are numerous legendary traditions about Plato's voyages in his quest for knowledge[76]. The philosopher is said to have gone to Kyrene, Italy and Egypt. According to some ancient authors, he also intended to visit the *Magi* in Persia, but was prevented from travelling there because of war[77]. Olympiodoros states that Plato therefore travelled to Phoenicia and that *Magi* instructed him there[78]. Some modern scholars are of the opinion that these stories are modelled on those concerning the alleged travels of Pythagoras[79] and other Greek wise men and do not, therefore, bear relation to historical reality[80]. Dörrie[81] distinguishes two contradictory tendencies within the legend about Plato's relation to the East. On the one hand, there is a tendency to represent Plato as a witness to Zoroastrian religion, but on the other, there is a need to prove the independence of the philosopher and his doctrine. A compromise was found in the story that Plato had met some *Magi* in Phoenicia and not in Persia, the only country

---

[73] Cf. Boyancé (1936: 274); Mensching (1963: 72).

[74] See e.g. Boyancé (1936: 254); Bidez (1945: 1-3); Gaiser (1983: 58) and (1988: 434-435); Lasserre (1987: 610-611).

[75] See Kingsley (1995: 204-207), who gives examples of the Greeks' acquaintance with oriental ideas prior to Plato and during his lifetime. Some authors, e.g. Jaeger (1955[2]: 133-138) and Chroust (1980: 356), attribute to Eudoxos of Knidos a determining role in this orientalizing process.

[76] Cf. Swift Riginos (1976: 61-69, anecdotes 22-24); Dörrie (1990: Bausteine 62-71).

[77] See Diog. Laert. 3,6-7; Apul. *Plat.* 1,3, who adds that Plato wanted to meet Indians as well (cf. Paus. 4,32,4, where it is stated that Plato and Aristotle followed Chaldaeans and Indian *Magi* in their doctrine about the immortality of the soul).

[78] See Olymp. *Comm. Plat.* 2,138-143; cf. Anon. *Proleg. in Plat. phil.* 4,12-14 Westerink, who relates the same story without, however, mentioning the fact that war kept Plato from going to Persia.

[79] On the model function of Pythagoras as a disciple of Zoroaster, see Dörrie (1990: Baustein 67).

[80] See e.g. Swift Riginos (1976: 66) and Dörrie (1990: 475-477); in (1990: 453-456), however, Dörrie denies that Plato ever went to Babylon or India, but does not seem to exclude the possibility that he met some *Magi* in Athens or Phoenicia.

[81] Dörrie (1990: 476-477).

where real initiation could have taken place. However, the version which was most flattering for Plato was the report that the philosopher did not go to Asia to be instructed by the *Magi*, but that these wise men came to Athens to learn from him[82].

Els Theys

Text editions

* A. Adler, *Suidae lexicon* IV (Lexicographi Graeci 1), Leipzig 1935 (= Stuttgart 1971).

H. Dörrie, *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus. Bausteine 36-72: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Der Platonismus in der Antike 2), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1990.

* T. Dorandi, *Filodemo, Storia dei filosofi [.] Platone e l'Academia (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Epicuro 12), Napoli 1991.

K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri* (Supplementum Platonicum 1), Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1988.

K. Gaiser, *Philochoros über zwei Statuen in Athen*, in B. von Freytag gen. Löringhoff *e.a.* (ed.), *Praestant interna. Festschrift für Ulrich Hausmann*, Tübingen 1982, p. 91-100.

O. Gigon, *Vita Aristotelis Marciana. Herausgegeben und kommentiert* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 181), Berlin 1962.

F. Lasserre, *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Texte und Kommentare 4), Berlin 1966.

F. Lasserre, *De Léodamas de Thasos à Philippe d'Oponte. Témoignages et fragments. Édition, Traduction et commentaire* (La scuola di Epicuro 2), Napoli 1987.

* H.S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* I (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1964 (= 1966).

S. Mekler, *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculanensis*, Berlin 1902 (= 1958).

E. Mensching, *Favorin von Arelate. Der erste Teil der Fragmente. Memorabilien und Omnigena Historia* (Texte und Kommentare 3), Berlin 1963.

L. Tarán, *Academica: Plato, Philip of Opus, and the Pseudo-Platonic Epinomis* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 107), Philadelphia 1975.

L.G. Westerink, *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Indices*, Amsterdam 1962.

* L.G. Westerink, *Prolégomènes à la philosophie de Platon. Texte établi par L.G. Westerink et traduit par J. Trouillard avec la collaboration de A. Ph. Segonds* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1990.

[82] Cf. *supra*, with n. 60.

Secondary literature

J. Bidez, *Eos, ou Platon et l'orient*, Bruxelles 1945.

P. Boyancé, *Le culte des muses chez les philosophes grecs. Études d'histoire et de psychologie religieuses*, Paris 1936 (= 1972).

W. Burkert, *Philodems Arbeitstext zur Geschichte der Akademie. Zu Tiziano Dorandis Neuedition des Academicorum Index*, in *ZPE* 97 (1993), p. 87-94 (= 1993a).

W. Burkert, *Platon in Nahaufnahme. Ein Buch aus Herculaneum*, Stuttgart - Leipzig 1993 (= 1993b).

A.-H. Chroust, *The Influence of Zoroastrian Teachings on Plato, Aristotle, and Greek Philosophy in General*, in *The New Scholasticism* 54 (1980), p. 342-357.

E. Dönt, *Platons Spätphilosophie und die Akademie. Untersuchungen zu den platonischen Briefen, zu Platons "Ungeschriebene Lehre" und zur Epinomis des Philipp von Opus*, Wien 1967.

K. Gaiser, *La biografia di Platone in Filodemo: nuovi dati dal PHerc. 1021*, in *CErc* 13 (1983), p. 53-62.

W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Berlin 1955² (= Frankfurt am Main 1967).

P. Kingsley, *Meetings with Magi: Iranian Themes among the Greeks, from Xanthus of Lydia to Plato's Academy*, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, S. III 5 (1995), p. 173-209.

F. Lasserre, *Le Barbare, le Grec et la Science selon Philippe d'Oponte*, in *MH* 40 (1983), p. 169-177 (= 1983a).

F. Lasserre, *Hermodore de Syracuse dans PHerc. 1021 et 164?*, in *CErc* 13 (1983), p. 63-74 (= 1983b).

F. Müller, *Stilistische Untersuchung der Epinomis des Philippus von Opus*, Diss. Berlin 1927.

F. Novotný, *Platonis Epinomis. Commentariis illustrata*, Praha 1960.

F. Novotný, *The Posthumous Life of Plato*, Praha 1977.

W.A. Oldfather, *Lokrika. Sagengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, in *Philologus* 67 (1908), p. 411-472.

R.F. Stalley, *An Introduction to Plato's Laws*, Oxford 1983.

A. Swift Riginos, *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden 1976.

A.E. Taylor, *Plato and the Authorship of the Epinomis*, London 1929 (= New York 1975).

G.J. Toomer, art. *Eudoxus* (1), in *OCD* (1996³), p. 565-566.

K. Trampedach, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994.

K. von Fritz, art. *Philippos* (42), in *RE* 19,2 (1938), col. 2351-2366.

E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, II 1. *Sokrates und die Sokratiker-Plato und die Alte Akademie. Im Anhang* Der gegenwärtige Stand der Platonforschung, *von E. Hoffmann*, Leipzig 1922⁵ (= Darmstadt 1963).

—. Erastos

ΑΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ

cf. *FGrHist* IV F

1012. Phainias of Eresos

(4th century B.C.; floruit 336-332 B.C.)

T

1 (= *FHG* II p. 293 = F 1 Wehrli IX) *Suda* Φ 73 *s.v.* Φανίας ἢ Φαινίας· Ἐρέσιος, φιλόσοφος περιπατητικός, Ἀριστοτέλους μαθητής. Ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ρια’ ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ μετέπειτα, ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος.

2 (= F 2 Wehrli IX) Strab. *Geogr.* 13,2,4 C. 618: Ἐξ Ἐρέσου δ’ ἦσαν Θεόφραστός τε καὶ Φανίας οἱ ἐκ τῶν περιπάτων φιλόσοφοι, Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμοι.

3 (= F 3 Wehrli IX) Diog. Laert. 5,2,50: Ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ ἐπι<γραφόμεναι> τῷ Ἀστυκρέοντι Φανίᾳ Νικάνορι.

4 (= F 4 Wehrli IX) Diog. Laert. 5,2,37-38: Οὗτος (*sc.* Θεόφραστος) τά τε ἄλλα καὶ περὶ δεικτηρίου τοιαῦτα διείλεκται ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φανίαν τὸν περιπατητικὸν ἐπιστολῇ· “Οὐ γὰρ ὅτι πανήγυριν, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ συνέδριον ῥᾴδιον, οἷόν τις βούλεται, λαβεῖν· αἱ δὲ ἀναγνώσεις ποιοῦσιν ἐπανορθώσεις· τὸ δ’ ἀναβάλλεσθαι πάντα καὶ ἀμελεῖν οὐκέτι φέρουσιν αἱ ἡλικίαι.” Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ σχολαστικὸν ὠνόμακε <ἑαυτὸν>. Τοιοῦτος δ’ ὢν ὅμως ἀπεδήμησε πρὸς ὀλίγον καὶ οὗτος καὶ πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ φιλόσοφοι, Σοφοκλέους τοῦ Ἀμφικλείδου νόμον εἰσενεγκόντος μηδένα τῶν φιλοσόφων σχολῆς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, ἂν μὴ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ δόξῃ· εἰ δὲ μή, θάνατον εἶναι τὴν ζημίαν.

5 (= F 5 Wehrli IX) Schol. Apoll. Rhod. A 972 p. 85 Wendel: Λέγεται δε, ἴουλος καὶ ζῷόν τι, θηρίδιον πολύπουν· ἑκατέρωθεν γὰρ ἔχει πολλοὺς πόδας ὥσπερ ἡ σκολόπενδρα. Θεόφραστος δὲ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φανίαν ἐπιστολῇ (F 185 Wimmer = F 374 Fortenbaugh) καὶ ὄνον φησὶν αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι, ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Κωφοῖς Σατύροις (F 363 *TGrF* Radt)· κυλισθεὶς ὥς τις ὄνος ἰσόσπριος.

---

2 Ἐρέσιος *editio Basil.* : Αἱρέσιος *codd.* **7** ἐπι<γραφόμεναι> *Regenbogen* : ἐπὶ *codd.* **10** δεικτηρίου B^2 *habuit* F^1 *V* : δικτηρίου B^1 *P ante corr. Q* : δικτηρίου γε P^3 : δικτηρίου (= δικαστηρίου) *P post corr.* F^2 : δικαστηρίου *WV in marg. vulgo* : διδασκαλίου *Wyse* : διδακτηρίου *Apelt (cf. Glotz 1920: 202)* δεικτηρίου **14** ὠνόμακε : ὠνόμακε <ἑαυτὸν> *fort. suppl., cf. Regenbogen (1940: 1359)* **23** ὥς τις *L* : ὥσπερ *P* **24** ἰσόσπριος *Hesych. Photios* : ἰσοπριος *codd.*

1012. Phainias of Eresos

(4th century B.C.; floruit 336-332 B.C.)

T

1 Phanias or Phainias of Eresos, a Peripatetic philosopher, a disciple of Aristotle. He lived about the time of the 111th Olympiad and later during the reign of Alexander of Macedon.

2 Theophrastos and Phanias, the Peripatetic philosophers and disciples of Aristotle, were both from Eresos.

3 Correspondence with Astykreon, Phanias and Nikanor.

4 In a letter to Phanias the Peripatetic he (*sc.* Theophrastos) speaks, among other topics, of a draft of a work as follows: "To get a public or even a select circle such as one desires is not easy. If an author reads his work, he must re-write it. Always to shirk revision and ignore criticism is a course which the present generation of pupils will no longer tolerate". And in this letter he has called someone <himself ?> a scholar. Although his reputation stood so high, he nevertheless had to leave the country for a short time with all other philosophers, when Sophokles the son of Amphikleides proposed a law that no philosopher should preside over a school except by permission of the council and the people, under penalty of death.

5 Wood-louse (?) is the name of an animal and it is a small animal with many feet; for it has many feet on both sides of its body like the millepede. Theophrastos in his letter to Phanias says that this animal is also called *Onos* as Sophokles says in his play "*The Deaf Satyrs*": "He rolled like a wood-louse (*i.e.* an insect that rolls itself up like a bean)".

6 (= F 6 Wehrli IX) *Vita Aristotelis Marciana* p. 430 Rose: Ὅσα δὲ πόλεις ὅλας (*sc.* εὐεργέτησεν Ἀριστοτέλης) τὰ Στάγειρα δηλοῖ καὶ Ἐρεσσὸς ἡ Θεοφράστου καὶ Φανίου τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν πατρίς ... καὶ Ἐρεσσὸν μέλλουσαν ὑπὸ Φιλίππου πολιορκηθῆναι ἔπεισεν ἀφεθῆναι.

7 (= F 7 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Non posse* 1097b Pohlenz: Τίνας οὖν οἰόμεθα καὶ πηλίκας ἡδονὰς εἶναι τὰς Πλάτωνος, ὁπηνίκα Δίων ὁρμήσας ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατέλυσε Διονύσιον καὶ Σικελίαν ἠλευθέρωσε; τίνας δ᾽ Ἀριστοτέλους, ὅτε τὴν πατρίδα κειμένην ἐν ἐδάφει πάλιν ἀνέστησε καὶ κατήγαγε τοὺς πολίτας; τίνας δὲ Θεοφράστου καὶ Φαινίου τοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἐκκοψάντων τυράννους; ἰδίᾳ μὲν γὰρ ὅσοις ἐβοήθησαν ἀνδράσιν, οὐ πυροὺς διαπέμποντες οὐδ᾽ ἀλφίτων μέδιμνον, ὡς Ἐπίκουρος ἐνίοις ἔπεμψεν, ἀλλὰ φεύγοντας διαπραξάμενοι κατελθεῖν καὶ δεδεμένους λυθῆναι καὶ τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας ἐστερημένους ἀπολαβεῖν, τί ἂν λέγοι τις ὑμῖν ἀκριβῶς εἰδόσιν;

F

1. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΣΙΚΕΛΙΑΙ ΤΥΡΑΝΝΩΝ
(F 1; 2 ?)

1 (= *FHG* II p. 297 F 12 = F 11 Wehrli IX) Athen. 6,231e-232d: Καὶ τὰ ἐν Δελφοῖς δὲ ἀναθήματα τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χρυσᾶ ὑπὸ πρώτου Γύγου τοῦ Λυδῶν βασιλέως ἀνετέθη· καὶ πρὸ τῆς τούτου βασιλείας ἀνάργυρος, ἔτι δὲ ἄχρυσος ἦν ὁ Πύθιος, ὡς Φαινίας τέ φησιν ὁ Ἐρέσιος καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν (*FGrHist* 115 F 193). Ἱστοροῦσι γὰρ οὗτοι κοσμηθῆναι τὸ Πυθικὸν ἱερὸν ὑπό τε τοῦ Γύγου καὶ τοῦ μετὰ τοῦτον Κροίσου, μεθ᾽ οὓς ὑπό τε Γέλωνος καὶ Ἱέρωνος τῶν Σικελιωτῶν, τοῦ μὲν τρίποδα καὶ Νίκην χρυσοῦ πεποιημένα ἀναθέντος καθ᾽ οὓς χρόνους Ξέρξης ἐπεστράτευε τῇ Ἑλλάδι, τοῦ δ᾽ Ἱέρωνος τὰ ὅμοια. Λέγει δ᾽ οὕτως ὁ Θεόπομπος· "Ἦν γὰρ τὸ παλαιὸν τὸ ἱερὸν κεκοσμημένον χαλκοῖς ἀναθήμασιν, οὐκ ἀνδριᾶσιν ἀλλὰ λέβησι καὶ τρίποσι χαλκοῦ πεποιημένοις. Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὖν χρυσῶσαι βουλόμενοι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ

---

26 εὐεργέτησεν : εὐηργέτησεν *Rose* **31** ὅτε *om. g* **33** δὲ *om. g* **33** Φαινίου *Rasmus Sauppe* : φεινίου *g* φειδίου *Ξ* **34** ἀνδράσιν : ἄδραστος *g* **34** πυροὺς : πῦρ *Γ* **37** λέγοι : λέγη *g* **41** Φαινίας : φανίας *A* **46** ἦν γὰρ-ἐκ Σικελίας *epitomatoris culpa hiatibus abundare statuit Kaibel* **48** μὲν οὖν *Kaibel*

6 To what extent (*sc.* Aristotle became) the benefactor of whole cities is clear from the examples of Stageira and Eresos, the native city of his disciples Theophrastos and Phanias. ... And when Philip was about to lay siege on Eresos, he dissuaded him from doing so.

7 Then how high and full must have been the pleasure Plato knew when Dion, influenced by his teachings, overthrew Dionysios and set Sicily free? Or Aristotle, when he raised again his native city, levelled to the ground, and restored it to his countrymen? Or Theophrastos and Phanias, who cleared away the tyrants from their city? In private life what need is there to tell you, who know it well, of the many they helped—not sending them wheat or a bushel of meal as Epikuros did to a few, but obtaining remission of banishment, release from prison, and restoration of wives and children that had been taken from them?

F

1. ON THE TYRANTS OF SICILY

1 Now the votive offerings of silver and gold at Delphi, had been dedicated for the first time by Gyges, who was king of Lydia; and before his reign, the god at Delphi had no silver, much less gold, as Phainias of Eresos tells us, and Theopompos in the fortieth book of his *History of Philip*. For these authorities record that the Pythian shrine was adorned by Gyges and his successor Kroisos, and after them by Gelon and Hieron, the Sicilian Greeks. The former dedicated a tripod and a goddess of victory made of gold about the time when Xerxes was making his invasion of Greece, the latter dedicated similar offerings. The words of Theopompos are as follows: "For in ancient times the sacred precinct was adorned with bronze offerings which were not statues, but cauldrons and tripods made of bronze. Now the Lacedaemonians, desiring to gild the face of

ἐν Ἀμύκλαις Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκοντες ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι χρυσίον πέμψαντες [εἰς θεοῦ] ἐπηρώτων τὸν θεὸν παρ' οὗ χρυσίον πρίαιντο. Ὁ δ' αὐτοῖς ἀνεῖλεν παρὰ Κροῖσου τοῦ Λυδοῦ πορευθέντας ὠνεῖσθαι [παρ' ἐκείνου]. Καὶ οἱ πορευθέντες παρὰ Κροίσου ὠνήσαντο. Ἱέρων δ' ὁ Συρακόσιος βουλόμενος ἀναθεῖναι τῷ θεῷ τὸν τρίποδα καὶ τὴν Νίκην ἐξ ἀπέφθου χρυσοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἀπορῶν χρυσίου ὕστερον ἔπεμψε τοὺς ἀναζητήσοντας εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· οἵτινες μόλις ποτ' εἰς Κόρινθον ἀφικόμενοι καὶ ἐξιχνεύσαντες εὗρον παρ' Ἀρχιτέλει τῷ Κορινθίῳ, ὃς πολλῷ χρόνῳ συνωνούμενος κατὰ μικρὸν θησαυροὺς εἶχεν οὐκ ὀλίγους. Ἀπέδοτο γοῦν τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Ἱέρωνος ὅσον ἠβούλοντο καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πληρώσας καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χεῖρα ὅσον ἠδύνατο χωρῆσαι ἐπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς. Ἀνθ' ὧν Ἱέρων πλοῖον σίτου καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ δῶρα ἔπεμψεν ἐκ Σικελίας." Ἱστορεῖ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ Φαινίας ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ τυράννων (*FHG* II p. 297 F 12), ὡς χαλκῶν ὄντων τῶν παλαιῶν ἀναθημάτων καὶ τριπόδων καὶ λεβήτων καὶ ἐγχειριδίων, ὧν ἐφ' ἑνὸς καὶ ἐπιγεγράφθαι φησίν·

θάησαί μ'· ἐτεὸν γὰρ ἐν Ἰλίου εὐρέι πύργῳ
ἦν, ὅτε καλλικόμῳ μαρνάμεθ' ἀμφ' Ἑλένῃ·
καί μ' Ἀντηνορίδης ἐφόρει κρείων Ἑλικάων·
νῦν δέ με Λητοίδου θεῖον ἔχει δάπεδον.

Ἐπὶ δὲ τρίποδος, ὃς ἦν εἷς τῶν ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ ἄθλων τεθέντων·

χάλκεός εἰμι τρίπους, Πυθοῖ δ' ἀνάκειμαι ἄγαλμα·
καί μ' ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ θῆκεν πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
Τυδείδης δ' ἀνέθηκε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης,
νικήσας ἵπποισι παρὰ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον.

2 (= *FHG* F 13 = F 13 Wehrli IX) Athen. 1,6e (Philoxenos F 3 (816) *PMG* Page): Φαινίας δέ φησιν ὅτι Φιλόξενος ὁ Κυθήριος ποιητής, περιπαθὴς ὢν τοῖς ὄψοις, δειπνῶν ποτε παρὰ Διονυσίῳ ὡς εἶδεν ἐκείνῳ μὲν μεγάλην τρῖγλαν παρατεθεῖσαν, ἑαυτῷ δὲ μικράν, ἀναλαβὼν αὐτὴν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας πρὸς τὸ οὖς προσήνεγκε. Πυθομένου δὲ τοῦ Διονυσίου τίνος ἕνεκεν τοῦτο ποιεῖ, εἶπεν ὁ Φιλόξενος ὅτι γράφων τὴν Γαλάτειαν βούλοιτό τινα παρ' ἐκείνης τῶν κατὰ Νηρέα πυθέσθαι· τὴν δὲ ἠρωτημένην ἀποκεκρίσθαι

---

49 εἰς θεοῦ *exp. Meineke* : εἰς Δελφοὺς *Fuhr* **50** Κροῖσον τὸν Λυδὸν *Schweighäuser* : Κροίσου τοῦ Λυδοῦ *codd.* **51** παρ' ἐκείνου *om. C, exp. Kaibel* **51** Κροίσου : Κροῖσον *Jacoby dub., Grenfell-Hunt* **56** ὅσον *Casaubonus* : ὃν *A C* **58** Φαινίας : φανίας *A* **73** Διονυσίῳ : Διονυσίῳ τῷ τυράννῳ *Suda* ***Φ*** *394* **75** εἰς τὰς χεῖρας *om. Suda* **76** πυθομένου-Γαλάτειαν : ὡς *Suda* **78** τὴν δὲ *C* : τὴν δεσπότιν *E* **78** ἀποκεκρίσθαι *Suda* : οὐκ ἀποκεκρίσθαι *CE* : *fort.* οὐκ ἀποκεκρίσθαι εἰδέναι *Kaibel dub.*

the Apollon of Amyclae, but not finding any gold in Greece, sent to the oracle of the god and asked the god whom they should purchase gold from. And he returned an answer to them to the effect that they should go and buy it from Kroisos the Lydian. And so they went and bought it from Kroisos. As for Hieron of Syracuse, he desired to dedicate to the god the tripod and the goddess of victory of refined gold; for a long time he was at a loss how to get it, and finally sent messengers to search for it in Greece, who at last came to Corinth, and on investigation found it in the house of the Corinthian Architeles. He had been buying up small amounts for a long time, and had a large store. Thus, he sold to Hieron's agents all that they wanted, and then, filling his hand with as much as it could hold, he added that as a present to them. In return for this Hieron sent from Sicily a shipload of grain and many other gifts". Phainias records the same facts in his work *On the Tyrants of Sicily*, and also that the ancient votive offerings were of bronze, whether tripods, cauldrons, or daggers; and on one of these, he says, is this inscription:

"Behold me; for verily I was in Ilion's broad tower,
that time we fought for Helena with the beautiful tresses;
and Antenor's son, lordly Helikaon, carried me.
But to-day the sacred soil of Leto's son holds me in its keeping".

On the tripod, which was one of the prizes offered at the games in honour of Patroklos, was inscribed:

"A bronze tripod am I, dedicated as an offering at Pytho,
and Achilles, swift of foot, staked me in honour of Patroklos.
And Tydeus' son, Diomedes good at the cry, made offering of me after his victory with racehorses beside the broad Hellespont".

2 Phainias says that Philoxenos, the poet of Cythera, who was wild about dainty food, was once dining with Dionysios, and when he saw that a large mullet had been set before Dionysios, while a small one had been served to himself, he took it up in his hands and placed it to his ear. When Dionysios asked him why he did that, Philoxenos answered that he was writing a poem on Galateia and desired to ask the mullet some questions about Nereus and his daughters. And the creature, on being asked, had answered that she had been

διότι νεωτέρα ἁλοίη· διὸ μὴ παρακολουθεῖν· τὴν δὲ τῷ Διονυσίῳ παρατεθεῖσαν πρεσβυτέραν οὖσαν εἰδέναι πάντα σαφῶς ἃ βούλεται μαθεῖν. Τὸν οὖν Διονύσιον γελάσαντα ἀποστεῖλαι αὐτῷ τὴν τρῖγλαν τὴν παρακειμένην αὐτῷ. Συνεμέθυε δὲ τῷ Φιλοξένῳ ἡδέως ὁ Διονύσιος. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἐρωμένην Γαλάτειαν ἐφωράθη διαφθείρων, εἰς τὰς λατομίας ἐνεβλήθη· ἐν αἷς ποιῶν τὸν Κύκλωπα συνέθηκε τὸν μῦθον εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν γενόμενον πάθος, τὸν μὲν Διονύσιον Κύκλωπα ὑποστησάμενος, τὴν δ' αὐλητρίδα Γαλάτειαν, ἑαυτὸν δ' Ὀδυσσέα.

2. ΤΥΡΑΝΝΩΝ ΑΝΑΙΡΕΣΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΙΜΩΡΙΑΣ
(F 3-4; 5-6 ?)

3 (= *FHG* F 15 = F 14 Wehrli IX) Athen. 10,438c: Φαινίας δὲ ὁ Ἐρέσιος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας Σκόπαν φησι τὸν Κρέοντος μὲν υἱόν, Σκόπα δὲ τοῦ παλαιοῦ υἱδοῦν φιλοποτοῦντα διατελέσαι καὶ τὴν ἐπάνοδον τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν συμποσίων ποιεῖσθαι ἐπὶ θρόνου καθήμενον καὶ ὑπὸ τεσσάρων βασταζόμενον οὕτως οἴκαδε ἀπιέναι.

4 (= *FHG* F 14 = F 15 Wehrli IX) Athen. 3,90e: Σωληνισταὶ δ' ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ συνάγοντες τὰ ὄστρεα ταῦτα, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Φαινίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας γράφων οὕτως· "Φιλόξενος ὁ καλούμενος σωληνιστὴς ἐκ δημαγωγοῦ τύραννος ἀνεφάνη, ζῶν τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἁλιευόμενος καὶ σωληνοθήρας ὤν· ἀφορμῆς δὲ λαβόμενος καὶ ἐμπορευσάμενος βίον ἐκτήσατο".

5 (= *FHG* F 16 = F 16 Wehrli IX) Parthen. *Erot. Pathem.* 7 Martini: Περὶ Ἱππαρίνου. Ἱστορεῖ Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος.

Ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἰταλῇ Ἡρακλείᾳ παιδὸς διαφόρου τὴν ὄψιν (Ἱππαρῖνος [ἦν] αὐτῷ ὄνομα τῶν πάνυ δοκίμων) Ἀντιλέων ἠράσθη· ὃς πολλὰ μηχανώνενος οὐδαμῇ δυνατὸς ἦν αὐτὸν ἁρμόσασθαι, περὶ δὲ γυμνάσια διατρίβοντι πολλὰ τῷ παιδὶ προσρυεὶς ἔφη τοσοῦτον αὐτοῦ πόθον ἔχειν, ὥστε πάντα

---

79 νεωτέρα οὖσα *Suda* : νεωτέρα *Athenaios* **82** τρῖγλαν : τρίγλην *E* **87** Ἐρέσιος : αἱρέσιος *A* **88** Σκοπαν *Leopardi* : σκότταν *A* **89** Σκόπα *Leopardi* : σκόττα *A* : κόττας *C* **100** Ἰταλῇ : Ἰταλικῇ *Heynius* **100** ἱππαρινος P^{1}, *acc. a* P^{2} **100** [ἦν] *exp. Meineke* **101** πάν^{υ} *P* **103** πολλὰ *del. Hercher* : τὰ πολλὰ *Zangemeister* : ποτε *Rose possis* πολλά<κις> **103** προσρυεὶς : προσφυεὶς *Legrand* **103** ἔφ[η] *in ras. P*

caught when too young, and therefore had not joined Nereus' company; but her sister, the one set before Dionysios, was older, and knew accurately all he wished to learn. So Dionysios, with a laugh, sent him the mullet that had been served to himself. Moreover, Dionysios was fond of getting drunk with wine in the company of Philoxenos. But when Philoxenos was caught in the act of seducing the king's mistress Galateia, he was thrown into the quarries. There he wrote his *Kyklops*, telling the story of what had happened to him, and representing Dionysios as Kyklops, the flute-girl as the nymph Galateia, and himself as Odysseus.

2. TYRANTS KILLED IN REVENGE

3 ... and Phainias of Eresos, in the work entitled *Tyrants Killed in Revenge*, says that Skopas, the son of Kreon and grandson of the elder Skopas, spent his life drinking and returned from drinking-bouts seated on a chair of state: thus, carried aloft by four men he used to make his homeward journey.

4 "Razor-fish-catchers" (*solenists*) was the name given to the men who gather these shell-fish, as Phainias of Eresos records in the book entitled *Tyrants Killed in Revenge*. He writes as follows: "Philoxenos, surnamed the solenist, rose from the position of demagogue to that of tyrant. At first he earned a living as a fisherman and was a catcher of razor-fish; but having accumulated some capital he won a competence by trade on a large scale".

5 On Hipparinos. The story comes from Phanias of Eresos: In Herakleia in southern Italy Antileon fell deeply in love with a young boy who was extraordinarily beautiful and came from a very noble family. His name was Hipparinos. Although Antileon had tried in many ways he was by no means able to become the permanent lover of the boy. When the boy did his regular exercises in the training grounds Antileon often came round, saying to him that his desire for him was so great that he would endure any laborious task for his sake and that he would not fail to accomplish

πόνον <ἂν> ἀνατλῆναι, καὶ ὅ τι ἂν κελεύοι, μηδενὸς αὐτὸν ἁμαρτήσεσθαι. Ὁ δὲ ἄρα κατειρωνευόμενος προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ἀπό τινος ἐρυμνοῦ χωρίου, ὃ μάλιστα ἐφρουρεῖτο ὑπό του τῶν Ἡρακλεωτῶν τυράννου, τὸν κώδωνα κατακομίσαι, πειθόμενος μὴ ἄν ποτε τελέσειν αὐτὸν τόνδε τὸν ἆθλον. Ἀντιλέων δὲ κρύφα τὸ φρούριον ὑπελθὼν καὶ λοχήσας τὸν φύλακα τοῦ κώδωνος κατακαίνει. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀφίκετο πρὸς τὸ μειράκιον ἐπιτελέσας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, ἐν πολλῇ αὐτῷ εὐνοίᾳ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐκ τοῦδε μάλιστα ἀλλήλους ἐφίλουν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ τύραννος τῆς ὥρας ἐγλίχετο τοῦ παιδὸς καὶ οἷός τε ἦν αὐτὸν βίᾳ ἄγεσθαι, δυσανασχετήσας ὁ Ἀντιλέων ἐκείνῳ μὲν παρεκελεύσατο μὴ ἀντιλέγειν κινδυνεύειν, αὐτὸς δὲ οἴκοθεν ἐξιόντα τὸν τύραννον προσδραμὼν ἀνεῖλεν. Καὶ τοῦτο δράσας δρόμῳ ἵετο καὶ διέφυγεν ἄν, εἰ μὴ προβάτοις συνδεδεμένοις ἀμφιπεσὼν ἐχειρώθη· διὸ τῆς πόλεως εἰς τἀρχαῖον ἀποκαταστάσης ἀμφοτέροις παρὰ τοῖς Ἡρακλεώταις ἐτέθησαν εἰκόνες χαλκαῖ καὶ νόμος ἐγράφη μηδένα ἐλαύνειν τοῦ λοιποῦ πρόβατα συνδεδεμένα.

6 (= Hermippos F 89 Wehrli IX = F 39 Bollansée): P.Herc. 1021 = Philod., *Ind. Ac. Herc.* col. 12,2-12,10 Dorandi; the restorations in col. 12, lines 10-16 follow Gaiser’s proposals:

Φαιν̣ίας δ’ αὐ̣[τ]ὸ̣ν̣ [λέ]|γει φιλότιμον ἐμ πλεο̣ν̣ε|ξίαι γενόμενον καὶ τῆ[ς γ’ Ὀ]|λ̣υμπικῆς νίκης [ἔ]τι κατ’ ἀξί|α̣ν τύραννον [ἀν]α̣φανῆ̣ναι| ν̣εαν̣ι̣κόν. Ἐπ̣[ι]χειρῆσαι δέ | τινες αὐτὸν λ̣έγουσιν κ[αὶ] | πόλιν κτίσα̣[ι Χαι]ρώ̣νεια̣ν̣ ἐγγὺ̣ς τῶ̣ν [κα]λ̣ουμένω̣ν | Μεγαρικ[ῶν ὥσπερ οἰ]κει̣ | ων τελ̣[μάτων. Καὶ̣] αὐτὸν|λέγετ̣[αι σφόδρα] ἐπιθ[έ-] |μενο̣[ν ἐν τῷ Ἰ]σθ[μ]ῷ̣ π[ό-] |ρ̣ο[ν̣] δι[ορύττειν ἀπ]ο̣χρῶ̣ν̣[τα]|τῆ[ς] ἐνώ[σεως ἀτυχ]εῖν.

---

104 ἀνατλῆναι : ἂν τλῆναι *Meineke* <ἂν> ἀνατλῆναι *Rose et Zang.* **104** κελεύῃ *Meineke* : κελεύοι *P* **106** ἐφρουρειτο *acc. a* P^2 **106** ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν *Martini* : ὑπὸ του *P, corr. Gale* : *in marg.* τοῦ ἀρχελάου P^1, *quod Meineke in textum recepit* **107** κατακομίσαι : κατακομί(-σ)αι *P in ras.* **107** ἄν *exp. Cobet* **107** τελέσειν : τελέσαι *Schneider* **108** ὑπελθὼν : ὑπεισελθὼν *Legrand* **109** κἀπειδὴ *Hercher* **110** κἀκ τοῦδε *Hercher* **111** τύρανος *P* **112** οἷός τε : οἷος *Cobet* **112** αὐτὸν : αὐτὸ(ν) *in lit. P* **112** βίᾳ ἄγεσθαι : βιάζεσθαι *Cobet* : βίᾳ προσάγεσθαι *Hercher* **113** μὴ ἀντιλέγειν κινδυνεύειν : μὴ ἀντιλέγοντα κινδυνεύειν *Scaliger* : μὴ ἀντιλέγειν μέλλοντι κινδυνεύειν *vel* μ. ἀ. κινδυνεύσοντι *Heynius, alii alia* **114** ἴετο *P, corr. Meineke* **117** χαλκαί P^1, *corr.* P^2 **123** τῆ[ς Ὀ|λ]υμπ. *Mekler* **123** [οὐ] *Wilamowitz et Mekler* **124** [θ]εα[τρι]κόν *Mekler* : πικρόν *Wilamowitz* **125** μακρῶν σ]κελ̣|ῶν *Schenkl*

whatever the boy should order him to do. Now the boy wanted to make a fool of him; so he gave him the order to go and fetch the tocsin from a certain stronghold that was closely guarded by the tyrant of the people of Herakleia. For the boy was sure that he (*sc.* the insistent lover) would never be able to fulfil this task. But Antileon managed to sneak into the stronghold, lay in ambush for the guard of the alarm-bell and slew him. When the man actually came back to the boy having fulfilled his promise he was allowed to enjoy his favour, and from that time on they were very much in love with each other. When the tyrant himself, however, felt a sudden desire for the beauty of the young boy, he was in a position to use even force to get him as his lover, but Antileon found this intolerable. He asked the boy not to take any personal risk by offering resistance to the tyrant, but threw himself upon the tyrant when he came out of his house and killed him. Having done so he ran away and would have succeeded in his flight had he not been overcome after running into a flock of sheep which was bound together. When the city of Herakleia had restored its old constitutional order bronze statues were erected in honour of both lovers in the town of the Heracleoteans and a law was passed that in future it was forbidden to drive a flock of sheep tied together.

6 Now Phainias says, that he (*sc.* Chairon of Pellene) had become possessed by ambition and in worthy consequence of his status as a victor at the Olympic games turned out to be an energetic tyrant. He even undertook, according to some authors, to found a new city named Chaironeia close to the Megarian marshes as if they were his property. And when he tried with all his energy to dig a passage deep and wide enough (*sc.* for the passage of ships) on the Isthmus (*sc.* of Corinth), he did not succeed in joining the two seas.

3. ΠΡΥΤΑΝΕΙΣ ΕΡΕΣΙΩΝ
(F 7; 8-10 ?)

7 (= *FHG* F 1 = F 17a Wehrli IX) Athen. 8,333a (= Eust. *Comm. Hom.* A v. 39 p. 57,26-28 van der Valk = F 17b Wehrli IX): Οἶδα δὲ καὶ πολλαχοῦ ὕσαντα τὸν θεὸν ἰχθύσι· Φαινίας γοῦν ἐν δευτέρῳ Πρυτάνεων Ἐρεσίων ἐν Χερρονήσῳ φησὶν ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὗσαι τὸν θεὸν ἰχθύας.

8 (= *FHG* F 1a = F 18 Wehrli IX) Athen. 1,16e: Καὶ οἵ μνηστῆρες δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ (*sc.* Ὁμήρῳ) "πεσσοῖσι προπάροιθε θυράων" (Hom. *Od.* 1,107) ἐτέρποντο, οὐ παρὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Διοδώρου [ἢ Θεοδώρου] μαθόντες τὴν πεττείαν οὐδὲ τοῦ Μιτυληναίου Λέοντος τοῦ ἀνέκαθεν Ἀθηναίου, ὃς ἀήττητος ἦν κατὰ τὴν πεττευτικήν, ὥς φησι Φανίας.

9 (= *FHG* F 2 = F 19 Wehrli IX) Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, cap. 21, § 139,3-4 Stählin: Εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ ἀπὸ Κέκροπος μὲν ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρον τὸν Μακεδόνα συνάγουσιν ἔτη χίλια ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι ὀκτώ, ἀπὸ δὲ Δημοφῶντος χίλια διακόσια πεντήκοντα, καὶ ἀπὸ Τροίας ἁλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἡρακλειδῶν κάθοδον ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἢ ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα. Ἀπὸ τούτου ἐπὶ Εὐαίνετον ἄρχοντα, ἐφ' οὗ φασιν Ἀλέξανδρον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβῆναι, ὡς μὲν Φανίας ἔτη ἑπτακόσια δεκαπέντε, ὡς δὲ Ἔφορος (*FGrHist* 70 F 223) ἑπτακόσια τριάκοντα πέντε, ὡς δὲ Τίμαιος (*FGrHist* 566 F 126) καὶ Κλείταρχος (*FGrHist* 137 F 7) ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι, ὡς δὲ Ἐρατοσθένης (*FGrHist* 241 F 1d) ἑπτακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα τέσσαρα, ὡς δὲ Δοῦρις (*FGrHist* 76 F 41) ἀπὸ Τροίας ἁλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου εἰς Ἀσίαν διάβασιν ἔτη χίλια.

10 (= *FHG* F 18 = F 33 Wehrli IX) Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, cap. 21, §131, 6 Stählin: Ναὶ μὴν καὶ Τέρπανδρον (*EGF* I p. 38 Kinkel) ἀρχαίζουσί τινες· Ἑλλάνικος γοῦν (*FGrHist* 4 F 85b) τοῦτον ἱστορεῖ κατὰ Μίδαν γεγονέναι, Φανίας δὲ πρὸ Τερπάνδρου τιθεὶς Λέσχην τὸν Λέσβιον Ἀρχιλόχου νεώτερον φέρει τὸν Τέρπανδρον, διημιλλῆσθαι δὲ τὸν Λέσχην Ἀρκτίνῳ καὶ νενικηκέναι.

---

134 ἢ Θεοδώρου *varia lectio, exp. Kaibel* : *Diodorus videtur is fuisse contra quem scripsit Phainias (FHG II p. 300)* **136** Φανίας : φανείας *C* : φανίας *E* **138** Κέκροπος] Ὠγύγου *Brandis* **139** χίλια ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι ὀκτώ] χίλια διακόσια πεντήκοντα *Gutschmidt* : χίλια διακόσια εἴκοσι ὀκτώ *Stählin* **139** Δημοφῶντος] Κέκροπος *Brandis* **139** χίλια διακόσια πεντήκοντα] ὀκτακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτώ *Gutschmidt* : ὀκτακόσια πεντήκοντα *Stählin* **140** [ἑκατὸν] *om. Gutschmidt* **141** Εὐαίνετον *Victorius* : εὐ[ε]ναι τον *L* (ἑ *suprascripsit* L^1) **142** Φανίας : φανείας *L* **143** Τίμαιος L^1 (τί *in quattuor litterarum ras.*) **145** [τέσσαρα] *Müller* **149** Μίδαν : μῆδαν *L* **149** Φανίας : φανείας *L* **150** Ἀρχιλόχου-τὸν Τέρπανδρον : Ἀρχίλοχον-τοῦ Τερπάνδρου *Unger, cf. Jacoby (1902: 148)*

3. THE PRYTANEIS OF ERESOS

7 I know, too, that it has rained fish in many places. Phainias, for example, says in the second book of *The Prytaneis of Eresos* that on the Chersonesos it rained fish for three whole days.

8 The suitors in Homer amused themselves by playing "draughts before the doors". They could not have learned the game from the celebrated Diodoros or Theodoros, or the Mitylenaean Leon, whose ancestry was Athenian, and who, according to Phanias, was never beaten at draughts.

9 There are some authors who calculate from the time of Kekrops to Alexander the Macedonian one thousand 8 (?) hundred and 28 years, but from Demophon 1250 years, and from the capture of Troy to the return of the sons of Herakles 120 or 180 years. From then to the year in which Euainetos was archon, when—as it is said—Alexander crossed to Asia, according to Phanias 715 years, to Ephoros 735 years, to Timaios and Kleitarchos 820, following Eratosthenes 770 (or 774?) years, but acording to Duris from the capture of Troy to the crossing of Alexander to Asia 1000 years.

10 And indeed some make Terpandros an earlier writer than he is. For Hellanikos narrates that he lived in the time of Midas, but Phanias estimates that Lesches the Lesbian lived before Terpandros and thus makes Terpandros younger than Archilochos, whereas Lesches had been a victorious competitor against Arktinos.

4. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΙΚΩΝ
(F 11; 12 ?)

11 (= *FHG* F 20 = F 30 Wehrli IX = Antisthenes V A 172 Giannantoni) Diog. Laert. 6,8: Ἐρωτηθεὶς (*sc.* Ἀντισθένης) ὑπό του, καθά φησι Φανίας ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν Σωκρατικῶν, τί ποιῶν καλὸς κἀγαθὸς ἔσοιτο, ἔφη· "εἰ τὰ κακὰ ἃ ἔχεις ὅτι φευκνά ἐστι μάθοις παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων".

12 (= *FHG* F 21 = F 31 Wehrli IX = Aristippos IV A 1 Giannantoni) Diog. Laert. 2,65: Οὗτος (*sc.* Ἀρίστιππος) σοφιστεύσας, ὥς φησι Φανίας ὁ περιπατητικὸς ὁ Ἐρέσιος, πρῶτος τῶν Σωκρατικῶν μισθοὺς εἰσεπράξατο καὶ ἀπέστειλε χρήματα τῷ διδασκάλῳ. Καί ποτε πέμψας αὐτῷ μνᾶς εἴκοσι παλινδρόμους ἀπέλαβεν, εἰπόντος Σωκράτους τὸ δαιμόνιον αὐτῷ μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν· ἐδυσχέραινε γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτῳ.

5. ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΩΝ
(F 13)

13 (= *FHG* F 17 = F 32 Wehrli IX) Athen. 8,352c: Φαινίας δ' ὁ περιπατητικὸς ἐν δευτέρῳ Περὶ ποιητῶν "Στρατόνικος, φησίν, ὁ Ἀθηναῖος δοκεῖ τὴν πολυχορδίαν εἰς τὴν ψιλὴν κιθάρισιν πρῶτος εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ πρῶτος μαθητὰς τῶν ἁρμονικῶν ἔλαβε καὶ διάγραμμα συνεστήσατο. Ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ γελοίῳ οὐκ ἀπίθανος."

---

153 του *Menagius* : τοῦ P^{ac} : αὐτοῦ *(sc. a Socrate) BFP*^{pc} : Σωκράτους *Arsen.* **157** σοφιστεύσας *om. Ambros.* **157** Φανίας *codd., vett. edd.* : Φαινίας *Mannebach, Giannantoni* **158** μισθοὺς εἰσεπράξατο *codd.* : μισθενεπράττετο *N* : μισθοὺς ἐπράξατο *Suda* **159** ἀπέστειλε *F, Huebner, Cobet, Hicks* : ἀπέστελλε *BP, Mannebach* **160** ἔλαβεν *codd., Huebner* : παλινδρόμους : *cf. Suda s.v.* παλίνδρομος **160** Σωκράτους *om. Ambros.* **165** ἁρμονικῶν *Schweighäuser* : ἁρμενικῶν *A*

4. ON THE SOCRATICS

11 Phanias in his work *On the Socratics* tells us how someone asked him (*sc.* Antisthenes) what he must do to be a good and noble man, and he replied, "you must learn from those who know that the faults you have are to be avoided".

12 Having come forward as a lecturer or sophist, as Phanias of Eresos, the Peripatetic, informs us, he (*sc.* Aristippos) was the first of Sokrates' followers to charge fees and to sent money to his master; on one occasion a sum of twenty minai which he had send was returned to him, Sokrates declaring that the supernatural sign would not let him take it; the very offer in fact annoyed him.

5. ON POETS

13 The Peripatetic Phainias, in the second book of his treatise *On Poets*, says: "Stratonikos of Athens, it is agreed, was the first to introduce multiplicity of notes in simple harp-playing; he was also the first to receive pupils in harmony, and to compile a table of musical intervals. Nor in the matter of humour did he fail to hit the mark".

6. FRAGMENTS TAKEN FROM OTHER HISTORICAL OR BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS (F 14-23)

14 (= *FHG* F 3 = F 20 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Sol.* 14,1-3: Ἐνταῦτα δὴ τῶν Ἀθηναίων οἱ φρονιμώτατοι συνορῶντες τὸν Σόλωνα μόνον <ἢ> μάλιστα τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐκτὸς ὄντα, καὶ μήτε τοῖς πλουσίοις κοινωνοῦντα τῆς ἀδικίας, μήτε ταῖς τῶν πενήτων ἀνάγκαις ἐνεχόμενον, ἐδέοντο τοῖς κοινοῖς προσελθεῖν καὶ καταπαῦσαι τὰς διαφοράς. Καίτοι Φανίας ὁ Λέσβιος αὐτὸν ἱστορεῖ τὸν Σόλωνα, χρησάμενον ἀπάτῃ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῆς πόλεως, ὑποσχέσθαι κρύφα τοῖς μὲν ἀπόροις γῆς νέμησιν, τοῖς δὲ χρηματικοῖς βεβαίωσιν τῶν συμβολαίων. Ἀλλ' αὐτός φησιν ὁ Σόλων ὀκνῶν τὸ πρῶτον ἅψασθαι τῆς πολιτείας, καὶ δεδοικὼς τῶν μὲν τὴν φιλοχρηματίαν, τῶν δὲ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν.

15 (= *FHG* F 5 = F 21 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Sol.* 32,3: Ἐπεβίωσε δ' οὖν ὁ Σόλων ἀρξαμένου τοῦ Πεισιστράτου τυραννεῖν, ὡς μὲν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς (F 148 Wehrli VII) ἱστορεῖ, συχνὸν χρόνον, ὡς δὲ Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος ἐλάττονα δυεῖν ἐτῶν. Ἐπὶ Κωμίου μὲν γὰρ ἤρξατο τυραννεῖν Πεισίστρατος, ἐφ' Ἡγεστράτου δὲ Σόλωνά φησιν ὁ Φανίας ἀποθανεῖν τοῦ μετὰ Κωμίαν ἄρξαντος.

16a (= F 22a Wehrli IX) *Suda* K 2745 *s.v.* Κύρβεις· αἱ τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἑορτὰς ἔχουσαι· κρύβιές τινες οὖσαι, ἐν αἷς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀποκρυπτόμενα ἔδει εἶναι. Ἀσκληπιάδης, ὅτι ἀπὸ Κύρβεως τοῦ τὰς οὐσίας ὁρίσαντος. Ὥς φησι Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος, ἀπὸ τούτου ταῦτα κυρωθῆναι τοῖς γράμμασιν. **16b** (= *FHG* F 4 = F 22b Wehrli IX) *Et. Gud. s.v.* κύρβες = Asklepiades *FGrHist* 339 F 1 = Seleukos *FGrHist* 341 F 2: Σελεύκου· κύρβεις· αἱ τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἑορτὰς ἔχουσαι· ἤτοι ἀπὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς (εἰσὶ γὰρ κυρβασίαι), ἢ κύρβεις, ἐπεὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν

---

168 ἢ *add. Richards* **173** γῆς *Herwerden* **174** ὁ σόλων ὀκνῶν φησι *Υ* **174** καὶ *del. Cobet* **176** οὖν ὁ Σόλων *om. S* **178** συχνὸν *Υ*: πολὺν *S F* **178** Ἐρέσιος *Xylander Bryan* : ἐφέσιος *S*[m] *Υ* λέσβιος *S*[r] *Lindskog Flacelière* **178** δυοῖν *Υ* **179** Κωμέας *est Aristoteli* Ἀθπ. *14,1 et Marm. Par.* **179** ἐπ' *S* **183** κύβριές *A, Et.* **183** οὐσίας] θυσίας *Anecdota Graeca Oxoniensia 1, Gale, Salmasius* **185** Ἐρέσιος *Meursius* : *vel* Φανίας *contulit Hemsterhuis* **187** κύρβεις : κύρβες *vel* κύβερ *a b c* **188** κυρβασίαι ἢ κρύβεις *(Harpokr. s.v. = Apollodoros FGrHist 244 F 79) Reitzenstein* κυρβασταὶ ἢ κύρβιες (κύρβες, κύρβε, κρύβιες) *Et. Ekl.* κρύβεις *(om.* κυρβασίαι) *Epim.*

6. FRAGMENTS TAKEN FROM OTHER HISTORICAL OR BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

14 At this point the most level-headed of the Athenians began to look towards Solon. They saw that he, more than anyone else, stood apart from the injustices of the time and was involved neither in the extortions of the rich nor the privations of the poor, and so finally they appealed to him to come forward and settle their differences. Phainias of Lesbos, however, maintains that Solon of his own accord went behind the backs of both parties in order to save the city, and secretly promised the poor that he would redistribute the land, and the rich that he would guarantee the pledges which were their security. Solon's own version is that he only engaged in politics very unwillingly, because he was afraid of the grasping nature of the one party and the arrogance of the other.

15 According to Herakleides of Pontos, Solon lived on for many years after Peisistratos had made himself tyrant, but Phainias of Eresos maintains that he did not survive for more than two. Peisistratos first became tyrant during the archonship of Komeas, and Phainias states that Solon died in the archonship of Hegestratos, who succeeded Komeas.

16a *Kyrbeis*: those objects which list the festive days in honour of the gods; there are also *krybies*, on which the mysteries of the gods had to be written. Asklepiades (*sc.* says in his commentary on the Solonian *kyrbeis*) that a *kyrbis* signified the borders of landed property. As Phanias of Eresos says, legal ownership of land was validated by the letters (*sc.* on the *kyrbeis*). **16b** From Seleukos: *Kyrbeis*: They list the festive days in honour of the gods, namely from the preparation of the feasts (?); (for they are *kyrbasiai* (?); or *Kyrbeis*: since the mysteries of the gods have to be written on

ἀποκρυπτόμενα δεῖ εἶναι. Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Τῶν ἀξόνων ἐξηγητικοῖς ἀπὸ Κύρβεως τοῦ τὰς θυσίας ὁρίσαντος· – ἢ, ὡς φησι Φανίης ὁ Ἐρέσιος, [ἢ] ἀπὸ τοῦ ταῦτα κυρωθῆναι τοῖς γράμμασιν.

17 (= *FHG* F 6 = F 23 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Them.* 1,1-2: Θεμιστοκλεῖ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐκ γένους ἀμαυρότερα πρὸς δόξαν ὑπῆρχε· πατρὸς γὰρ ἦν Νεοκλέους οὐ τῶν ἄγαν ἐπιφανῶν Ἀθήνησι, Φρεαρρίου τῶν δήμων ἐκ τῆς Λεωντίδος φυλῆς, νόθος δὲ πρὸς μητρός, ὡς λέγουσιν·

Ἁβρότονον Θρήισσα γυνὴ γένος· ἀλλὰ τεκέσθαι
τὸν μέγαν Ἕλλησίν φημι Θεμιστοκλέα

(Athen. 13,576c = Amphikrates *FHG* IV p. 300 = *Anth. pal.* 7,306; Ael. *Var.hist.* 12,43). Φανίας μέντοι τὴν μητέρα τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους οὐ Θρᾷτταν, ἀλλὰ Καρίνην, οὐδ' Ἁβρότονον ὄνομα, ἀλλ' Εὐτέρπην ἀναγράφει. Νεάνθης (*FGrHist* 84 F 2 b) δὲ καὶ πόλιν αὐτῇ τῆς Καρίας Ἁλικαρνασσὸν προστίθησι.

18 (= *FHG* F 7 = F 24 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Them.* 7,5-7: Ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῖς Ἀφεταῖς τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ στόλου προσμείξαντος, ἐκπλαγεὶς ὁ Εὐρυβιάδης τῶν κατὰ στόμα νεῶν τὸ πλῆθος, ἄλλας δὲ πυνθανόμενος διακοσίας ὑπὲρ Σκιάθου κύκλῳ περιπλεῖν, ἐβούλετο τὴν ταχίστην εἴσω τῆς Ἑλλάδος κομισθεὶς ἅψασθαι Πελοποννήσου καὶ τὸν πεζὸν στρατὸν ταῖς ναυσὶ προσπεριβαλέσθαι, παντάπασιν ἀπρόσμαχον ἡγούμενος τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν ἀλκὴν βασιλέως, δείσαντες οἱ Εὐβοεῖς μὴ σφᾶς οἱ Ἕλληνες πρόωνται, κρύφα τῷ Θεμιστοκλεῖ διελέγοντο, Πελάγοντα μετὰ χρημάτων πολλῶν πέμψαντες. Ἃ λαβὼν ἐκεῖνος, ὡς Ἡρόδοτος (8,5) ἱστόρηκε, τοῖς περὶ τὸν Εὐρυβιάδην ἔδωκεν. Ἐναντιουμένου δ' αὐτῷ μάλιστα τῶν πολιτῶν Ἀρχιτέλους, ὃς ἦν μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς νεὼς τριήραρχος, οὐκ ἔχων δὲ χρήματα τοῖς ναύταις χορηγεῖν ἔσπευδεν ἀποπλεῦσαι, παρώξυνεν ἔτι μᾶλλον ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς τοὺς τριηρίτας ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸ δεῖπνον ἁρπάσαι συνδραμόντας. Τοῦ δ' Ἀρχιτέλους ἀθυμοῦντος ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ βαρέως φέροντος, εἰσέπεμψεν ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν κίστῃ δεῖπνον ἄρτων καὶ κρεῶν, ὑποθεὶς κάτω τάλαντον ἀργυρίου καὶ κελεύσας αὐτὸν τε δειπνεῖν ἐν τῷ παρόντι καὶ μεθ'

---

189 Ἀσκληπιάδης-ἐξηγητικοῖς *om. Epim.* **189** ἐν - ἐξηγητικοῖς *om. Et. Gen., Et. M.* **190** θυσίας *Epim.* οὐσίας *Et. Ekl.* **190** <ἢ> - [ἢ] *Reitzenstein* ἢ ἀπὸ *Et. Gen., Et. M. Epim.* ἀπὸ *Et. Gud.* **190** Φανιής *Et. Gud.* Φανίας *Et. M., Ekl.* **194** Λεωντίδος *Blass* : λεοντίδος *S Υ* **196** θρήισσα *Athen. Anth. Palat.* : θρῆσσα *S Υ* **196** γένος *libri et Athen.* : πέλον *Anth. Palat.* **197** φημι *libri et Anth. Palat.* : φασὶ *Athen.* **199** τοῦ *om. Υ* **202** ταῖς *SUM²* *et s. s. A* : τοῖς *M¹ Aᵗ* **207** ἀλκὴν *Υ* : ἀρχὴν *S* **208** πελαγῶντα *S* **210** μάλιστα *om. Υ* **213** τριηρίτας *Sintenis* : πολίτας *codd.* **214** ὁ *om. Υ*

them (?). Asklepiades in his commentary on the *axones* (*sc.* writes): *Kyrbeis* comes from the *kyrbis* (*sc.* boundary-stones or revolving pyramidal pillars for the publication of Solonian laws) which defines the sacrifices (*sc.* for the gods); or, as Phanias of Eresos says, *Kyrbeis*: from the fact that legal ownership of land was validated by the letters (*sc.* on such a *kyrbis*).

17 In the case of Themistokles his family was too obscure to have lent him any distinction at the beginning of his career. His father was Neokles, a man of no particular mark at Athens, who belonged to one of the demes of Phrearrus and the tribe of Leontis. On his mother's side he was an alien, as her epitaph tells us:

"Abrotonon is my name
A woman of Thrace, yet famous among the Greeks:
I was the mother of Themistokles".

However, according to Phainias, Themistokles' mother was not a Thracian but a woman of Caria, and her name was not Abrotonon but Euterpe, while Neanthes even adds the name of the city she came from in Caria—that is, Halikarnassos.

18 When the Persian fleet arrived at Aphetai, Eurybiades was appalled to learn the number of ships that he had to face. And when he also discovered that another 200 vessels were sailing round beyond the island of Skiathos to take him in the rear, his immediate impulse was to take the shortest way back into Greece, reach the Peloponnese and there use his land forces to screen the fleet, for he regarded the Persians as invincible at sea. This in turn alarmed the Euboeans, who were afraid that the rest of the Greeks might abandon them, and they got into touch with Themistokles secretly and sent Pelagon to him with large sums of money. Themistokles, according to Herodotos, accepted the money and gave it to Eurybiades. Among his own countrymen the bitterest opposition he encountered came from Architeles, the captain of the sacred state trireme, who was anxious to sail back to Athens because he did not have enough money to pay his crew. So Themistokles stirred up the feelings of Architeles' men against him to such a pitch that they made a rush at him and snatched away his dinner. Then while Architeles was still nursing his indignation and chagrin at this, Themistokles sent him a box containing a dinner of bread and meat and under it a talent of silver. He told Architeles to eat his dinner at once

ἡμέραν ἐπιμεληθῆναι τῶν τριηριτῶν· εἰ δὲ μή, καταβοήσειν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας ὡς ἔχοντος ἀργύριον παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Φανίας ὁ Λέσβιος εἴρηκεν.

19 (= *FHG* F 8 = F 25 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Them.* 13,2-5: Θεμιστοκλεῖ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ναυαρχίδα τριήρη σφαγιαζομένῳ τρεῖς προσήχθησαν αἰχμάλωτοι, κάλλιστοι μὲν ἰδέσθαι τὴν ὄψιν, ἐσθῆτι δὲ καὶ χρυσῷ κεκοσμημένοι διαπρεπῶς. Ἐλέγοντο δὲ Σανδάκης παῖδες εἶναι τῆς βασιλέως ἀδελφῆς καὶ Ἀρταΰκτου. Τούτους ἰδὼν Εὐφραντίδης ὁ μάντις, ὡς ἅμα μὲν ἀνέλαμψεν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν μέγα καὶ περιφανὲς πῦρ, ἅμα δὲ πταρμὸς ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐσήμηνε, τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα δεξιωσάμενος ἐκέλευσε τῶν νεανίσκων κατάρξασθαι καὶ καθιερεῦσαι πάντας ὠμηστῇ Διονύσῳ προσευξάμενον· οὕτω γὰρ ἅμα σωτηρίαν καὶ νίκην ἔσεσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Ἐκπλαγέντος δὲ τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους ὡς μέγα τὸ μάντευμα καὶ δεινόν, οἷον εἴωθεν ἐν μεγάλοις ἀγῶσι καὶ πράγμασι χαλεποῖς, μᾶλλον ἐκ τῶν παραλόγων ἢ τῶν εὐλόγων τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐλπίζοντες οἱ πολλοὶ τὸν θεὸν ἅμα κοινῇ κατεκαλοῦντο φωνῇ, καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους τῷ βωμῷ προσαγαγόντες ἠνάγκασαν, ὡς ὁ μάντις ἐκέλευσε, τὴν θυσίαν συντελεσθῆναι. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος καὶ γραμμάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος ἱστορικῶν Φανίας ὁ Λέσβιος εἴρηκε.

20 (= *FHG* F 9 = F 26 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Them.* 27,1-8 (*cf.* Artemidor 10,4): Θουκυδίδης (1,137,3) μὲν οὖν καὶ Χάρων ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς (*FGrHist* 262 F 11) ἱστοροῦσι τεθνηκότος Ξέρξου πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεμιστοκλεῖ γενέσθαι τὴν ἔντευξιν· Ἔφορος (*FGrHist* 70 F 190) δὲ καὶ Δείνων (*FGrHist* 690 F 13) καὶ Κλείταρχος (*FGrHist* 137 F 33) καὶ Ἡρακλείδης (*FGrHist* 689 F 6), ἔτι δ' ἄλλοι πλείονες πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικέσθαι τὸν Ξέρξην. Τοῖς δὲ χρονικοῖς δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης συμφέρεσθαι, καίπερ οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἀτρέμα συντεταγμένοις. Ὁ δ' οὖν Θεμιστοκλῆς γενόμενος παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ δεινόν, ἐντυγχάνει πρῶτον Ἀρταβάνῳ τῷ χιλιάρχῳ, λέγων Ἕλλην μὲν εἶναι, βούλεσθαι δ' ἐντυχεῖν

---

218 πολίτας *Υ* : παρόντας *S* **218** ἔχοντας *S* **221** δὲ *om. U. add. s. l. U²* **222** ἐσθῆσι *Υ* **222** δὲ *om. Υ* **223** δὲ *om. S* **223** σανδάκης *MA* : σανδαύκης *SU, cf. Plut. Arist. 9,2* **226** ἐκ τῶν δεξίων *Υ* **227** καθιερῶσαι *em. Sintenis* **228** καὶ *S* : τε καὶ *Υ* **231** ἐλπίζοντες : γρ. πορίζοντες *Sᵐ (m. 1)* **239** Δείνων *semper Plut., sed cf. Schwartz (1903: 654)* Δίνων **241** τὸν *om. S* **242** αὐτοῖς *Υ* : αὐτὸς *S* **242** συντεταγμένοις *S* συνταττομένοις *Υ* : *em. Ziegler* συντεταραγμένοις *Cobet, cf. Gomme I (1945: 398)*

and look after his crew in the morning, otherwise he would denounce him publicly for accepting money from the enemy. This is the story we are told by Phainias of Lesbos.

19 Meanwhile, Themistokles was offering sacrifice alongside the admiral's trireme. Here three remarkably handsome prisoners were brought before him, magnificently dressed and wearing gold ornaments. They were reported to be the sons of Sandauke, the king's sister, and Artayktos. At the very moment that Euphrantides the prophet saw them, a great bright flame shot up from the victims awaiting sacrifice at the altar and a sneeze was heard on the right, which is a good omen. At this, Euphrantides clasped Themistokles by the right hand and commanded him to dedicate the young men by cutting off their forelocks and then to offer up a prayer and sacrifice them all to Dionysos, the Eater of Flesh, for if this were done, it would bring deliverance and victory to the Greeks. Themistokles was appalled at this terrible and monstrous command from the prophet, as it seemed to him. But the people, as so often happens at moments of crisis, were ready to find salvation in the miraculous rather than in a rational course of action. And so they called upon the name of the god with one voice, dragged the prisoners to the altar, and compelled the sacrifice to be carried out as the prophet had demanded. This, at any rate, is the account we have from Phainias of Lesbos, who was a philosopher and well read in history besides.

20 According to Thukydides and Charon of Lampsakos, Xerxes was now dead and it was his son Artaxerxes with whom Themistokles had his audience. On the other hand Ephoros, Deinon, Kleitarchos, Herakleides, and many other authorities maintain that he came to Xerxes. Thukydides' version seems to me to fit in better with the dates that are known to us over this period, although these are by no means firmly established. At any rate Themistokles now had to face his long-awaited ordeal, and he was received first of all by Artabanos, the vizier. Themistokles announced to him that he was a Greek and wished to have an audience with the king

βασιλεῖ περὶ πραγμάτων μεγάλων καὶ πρὸς ἃ τυγχάνοι μάλιστα σπουδάζων ἐκεῖνος. Ὁ δέ φησιν· "Ὦ ξένε, νόμοι διαφέρουσιν ἀνθρώπων· ἄλλα δ' ἄλλοις καλά· καλὸν δὲ πᾶσι τὰ οἰκεῖα κοσμεῖν καὶ σῴζειν. Ὑμᾶς μὲν οὖν ἐλευθερίαν μάλιστα θαυμάζειν καὶ ἰσότητα λόγος· ἡμῖν δὲ πολλῶν νόμων καὶ καλῶν ὄντων κάλλιστος οὗτος ἐστι, τιμᾶν βασιλέα καὶ προσκυνεῖν ὡς εἰκόνα θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα σῴζοντος. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπαινῶν τὰ ἡμέτερα προσκυνήσεις, ἔστι σοι καὶ θεάσασθαι βασιλέα καὶ προσειπεῖν· εἰ δ' ἄλλο τι φρονεῖς, ἀγγέλοις ἑτέροις χρήσῃ πρὸς αὐτόν. Βασιλεῖ γὰρ οὐ πάτριον ἀνδρὸς ἀκροᾶσθαι μὴ προσκυνήσαντος." Ταυθ' ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς ἀκούσας, λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· "Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν βασιλέως ὦ Ἀρτάβανε φήμην καὶ δύναμιν αὐξήσων ἀφῖγμαι, καὶ αὐτός τε πείσομαι τοῖς ὑμετέροις νόμοις, ἐπεὶ θεῷ τῷ μεγαλύνοντι Πέρσας οὕτω δοκεῖ, καὶ δι' ἐμὲ πλείονες τῶν νῦν βασιλέα προσκυνήσουσιν. Ὥστε τοῦτο μηδὲν ἐνποδὼν ἔστω τοῖς λόγοις, οὓς βούλομαι πρὸς ἐκεῖνον εἰπεῖν". - "Τίνα δέ", εἶπεν ὁ Ἀρτάβανος, "Ἑλλήνων ἀφῖχθαι φῶμεν; οὐ γὰρ ἰδιώτῃ τὴν γνώμην ἔοικας." Καὶ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς· "τοῦτ' οὐκ ἄν", ἔφη, "πύθοιτό τις Ἀρτάβανε πρότερος βασιλέως". Ὅυτω μὲν ὁ Φανίας φησίν· ὁ δ' Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τοῖς Περὶ πλούτου (*FGrHist* 241 F 27) προσιστόρησε, διὰ γυναικὸς Ἐρετρικῆς ἣν ὁ χιλίαρχος εἶχε τῷ Θεμιστοκλεῖ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔντευξιν γενέσθαι καὶ σύστασιν.

21 (= *FHG* F 11 = F 27 WEHRLI IX) ATHEN. 2,48C: Πρῶτοι δὲ Πέρσαι, ὥς φησιν Ἡρακλείδης (*FGrHist* 689 F 5), καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους στρώτας ἐφεῦρον, ἵνα κόσμον ἔχῃ ἡ στρῶσις καὶ εὐάφειαν. Τὸν οὖν [Κρῆτα] Τιμαγόραν ἢ τὸν ἐκ Γόρτυνος, ὥς φησι Φαινίας ὁ περιπατητικός, Ἔντιμον, ὃς ζήλῳ Θεμιστοκλέους ἀνέβη ὡς βασιλέα, τιμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης σκήνην τε ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαφέρουσαν τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ κλίνην ἀργυρόποδα, ἔπεμψε δὲ καὶ στρώματα πολυτελῆ καὶ τὸν ὑποστρώσοντα, φάσκων οὐκ ἐπίστασθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ὑποστρωννύειν. Καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ συγγενικὸν ἄριστον

245 πραγμάτων μεγάλων *S* : μεγίστων πραγμάτων *Υ* **245** τυγχάνει *Υ* **249** τιμᾶν *S* : τὸ τιμᾶν *Υ* **249** ὡς *om. Υ* **250** τὰ πάντα *Υ*: πάντα *S* **251** θεάσασθαι βασιλέα *S* : βασιλέα θεάσασθαι *Υ* **254** ἔγωγε *Υ* **257** ἔσται *ante corr. S (et sic H)* **259** ἀφῖχθαι *S* : ἀφῖχθαί σε *Υ* **260** οὐκ ἂν *S* : οὐκέτ' ἂν *Υ* **260** Ἀρτάβανε *om. S* **262** προσιστόρηκε *Ziegler* **262** αἱρετρικῆς *S* **266** τὸν οὖν Τιμ. ἢ τὸν ἐκ Γόρτυνος Κρῆτα *Voisin* **266** [Κρῆτα] *exp. Kaibel : sed vide Zecchini (1989a: 7-12)* **267** φαινίας *C* : φηνίας *E (in marg.* φαινίας) **267** ζήλῳ μετὰ Θεμ. *E* **268** βασιλεύς *C*

on matters which were of special concern to him and of the highest importance. Artabanos replied: “Stranger, the customs of men differ very greatly from one another. Every people has its own standards of right and wrong, but all agree that it is right to honour and uphold the customs of their own country. Now you Greeks have the reputation of admiring liberty and equality above all else. We, on the other hand, out of all the excellent laws we possess, take most pride in honouring the king and prostrating ourselves before him as the image of the god who is the preserver of the universe. If you approve our customs, then, and will make obeisance to him, you may see and speak to the king. But if your ideas are different, you must find intermediaries other than myself to communicate with him, since it is contrary to our customs for the king to give audience to a man who has not paid obeisance to him”. Themistokles, when he heard this, said: “My purpose in coming here, Artabanos, is to increase the king’s fame and his power, and I will not only comply with your customs myself, since this is the will of the god who exalts the Persians, but I will multiply the number of those who now do homage to the king. So do not let this matter stand in the way of what I have to tell him”. “Which of the Greeks”, asked Artabanos, “am I to say has arrived, for you are evidently a man far out of the ordinary run of intelligence”? “No one”, Themistokles replied, “must learn my name before the king himself”. This is the story we are told by Phainias, but Eratosthenes in his treatise *On Wealth* adds that Themistokles secured his interview and his conversation with the vizier through a woman of Eretria whom the latter had married.

21 The Persians were the first, according to Herakleides, to institute the so-called “bed-makers” in order that the couches are made ready and soft. Now Timagoras or Entimos from Gortyn in Crete, as Phainias the Peripatetic tells us, once went up to visit the great king, emulating Themistokles. In his honour Artaxerxes bestowed upon him a tent of extraordinary beauty and size, and a silver-footed bedstead; he also sent rich coverings and a slave to spread them, alleging that the Greeks did not know how to make a bed. This Cretan was even invited to a breakfast of the king’s relatives,

ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ Κρὴς οὗτος, τὸν βασιλέα ψυχαγωγήσας· ὅπερ οὐδενὶ πρότερον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὕστερον. Ἅυτη γὰρ ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς συγγενέσι διεφυλλάτετο. Τιμαγόρᾳ μὲν γὰρ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ τῷ προσκυνήσαντι βασιλέα καὶ μάλιστα τιμηθέντι τοῦτο οὐχ ὑπῆρξε· τῶν δὲ παρατιθεμένων βασιλεῖ τούτῳ τινὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης ἀπέστελλε. Ἀνταλκίδᾳ δὲ τῷ Λάκωνι τὸν αὑτοῦ στέφανον εἰς μύρον βάψας ἔπεμψε. Τῷ δ' Ἐντίμῳ τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ἐποίει καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ συγγενικὸν ἄριστον ἐκάλει. Ἐφ' ᾧ οἱ Πέρσαι χαλεπῶς ἔφερον ὡς τῆς τε τιμῆς δημευομένης καὶ στρατείας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πάλιν ἐσομένης. Ἔπεμψε δὲ καὶ κλίνην αὐτῷ ἀργυρόποδα καὶ στρωμνὴν καὶ σκηνὴν οὐρανοφόρον ἀνθινὴν καὶ θρόνον ἀργυροῦν καὶ ἐπίχρυσον σκιάδειον καὶ φιάλας λιθοκολλήτους χρυσᾶς εἴκοσι, ἀργυρᾶς δὲ μεγάλας ἑκατὸν καὶ κρατῆρας ἀργυροῦς καὶ παιδίσκας ἑκατὸν καὶ παῖδας ἑκατὸν χρυσοῦς τε ἑξακισχιλίους χωρίς τῶν εἰς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια καθ' ἡμέραν διδομένων.

22 (= *FHG* F 10 = F 28 Wehrli IX) Plut. *Them.* 29,11: Πόλεις δ' αὐτῷ (*sc.* Θεμιστοκλεῖ) τρεῖς μὲν οἱ πλεῖστοι δοθῆναι λέγουσιν εἰς ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον καὶ ὄψον, Μαγνησίαν καὶ Λάμψακον καὶ Μυοῦντα· δυὸ δ' ἄλλας προστίθησιν ὁ Κυζικηνὸς Νεάνθης (*FGrHist* 84 F 17 a) καὶ Φανίας, Περκώτην καὶ Παλαίσκηψιν εἰς στρωμνὴν καὶ ἀμπεχόνην.

23 (= *FHG* F 40 = F 29 Wehrli IX) Hesych *s.v.* κήρυκες Latte: Οἱ ἄγγελοι, οἱ διάκονοι, οἱ τὰς ὑπηρετικὰς ἐπιτελοῦντες πράξεις. Ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ γένος ἰθαγενῶν, ἀπὸ Κήρυκος τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ· Φανίας. Καὶ τοὺς ἐρινάζοντας τοὺς ἐρινοὺς κήρυκας λέγουσι.

---

276 τούτῳ *Casaubonus* : τούτων *CE* **278** εφ' ὧν *E* **282** εἴκοσι (*i. e.* κ̅) *Kaibel* : καὶ *CE* **283** ἀργυροῦς ἑκατὸν (*i.e.* ρ̅) *susp. Kaibel* **288** ἀμυοῦντα *Υ* **289** περκώπην *S*

since he had caught the king's fancy; this was an honour never accorded to any Greek before or since, being exclusively reserved for kinsmen. Certainly the Athenian Timagoras never enjoyed the honour, though he had paid obeisance to the king and had been received by him with special favour; but some of the food served to the king was merely sent to him from the table. To the Spartan Antalkidas he sent his own chaplet after dipping it in perfume. But for Entimos he not only did all this, but also invited him to breakfast *en famille*. The Persians took umbrage at this, because they felt that the honour was being vulgarized, and also because a new expedition against Greece was impending. But the king sent Entimos a silver-footed bed with its coverings, a tent with gaily-coloured canopy, a silver throne, a gilded sun-shade, twenty gold saucers set with jewels, one hundred large saucers of silver and silver mixing-bowls, one hundred concubines and one hundred slaves, and six thousand pieces of gold, beside all that was given to him for his daily necessities.

22 According to most writers he was given three cities to provide his bread, wine, and meat, namely Magnesia, Lampsakos, and Myous, while Neanthes of Kyzikos and Phanias add two more—Perkote and Palaiskepsis—which supplied his bedding and his clothes.

23 *Kerykes*: The messengers, or the servants who fulfil the function of domestics. *Kerykes* was also the name of a noble family clan, which derives its name from Keryx, the son of Hermes, as Phanias says. *Kerykes* are also called the people who hang boughs of the wild fig-tree near a cultivated fig-tree.

1012. Phainias of Eresos
(4th c. B.C.; floruit 336-332 B.C.)

Introduction and commentary on T 1-7

P.[1] lived in the fourth century B.C. He was one of the earliest pupils of Aristotle and became a leading scholar and prolific writer in the first generation of the Peripatos. Φαινίας is the spelling of his name found in inscriptions from his native island Lesbos and is therefore to be preferred to Φανίας, the Attic and common Greek form of the same name[2] used e.g. by Plutarch. An ancient biographical tradition, which has come down to us through Hesychios and an article in the *Suda*[3], places the ἀκμή of our Peripatetic in the 111th Olympiad (336-332 B.C.) and the reign of Alexander the Great (336-323 B.C.). If one takes into account the fact that P. and Theophrastos are recorded as being among the earliest pupils of Aristotle at Mytilene (from 345/44 on), P. may have been born about 365 B.C. or a few years earlier. At any rate, the calculation of some ancient biographers who added the standard number of 40 years to his ἀκμή in 336-332 B.C. and stated that P. was born in 376-373 B.C. is to be rejected[4]. P. probably died during Demetrios of Phaleron's administration in Athens (317-307 B.C.), but the exact year of his death is unknown. Unlike Theophrastos, Eudemos or Aristoxenos, P. never studied or lived as a scholar in the Peripatos at Athens while Aristotle was head of the school (335-323/22 B.C.).

In late Hellenistic and early imperial Roman times Theophrastos and P. were regarded as two of the most famous Eresians. The historian and geographer Strabo testifies this in his catalogue of ἄνδρες ἔνδοξοι from this city[5]. He calls Theophrastos and P. two pupils of Aristotle

---

[1] See F 1-7 Wehrli IX for the ancient testimonies on his life and F 8-51 Wehrli IX for the remains of his works; see also Laqueur (1938: 1565-1591) and Wehrli (1983: 461-473 on the Peripatos and 552-554 on P.).

[2] Cf. *IG* XII[2], 35, l. 14 for a Φαινίας Φαινίου and *SEG* XXVI 919 A, 14 for a Phainias from Lesbos; Fraser – Matthews (1987: 452) list two people called Phainias of Eresos (our philosopher and one other man), and three other namesakes from Mytilene.

[3] Cf. *Suda* Φ 73 *s.v.* Φανίας = T 1.

[4] Cf. Wehrli (1969c: 27) on T 1: "zwischen 376 und 373".

[5] Cf. Strab. *Geogr.* 13,2,4 C. 618 = T 2; Demetrios of Skepsis or Artemidoros are possible sources for Strabo's catalogue of ἄνδρες ἔνδοξοι; most of them are famous writers, philosophers or intellectuals, whereas only a minority are included because of their political or military career, as Leo has already remarked (Leo 1901: 132): "Die

who became—as was customary among his pupils—famous philosophers and scholars. P., as appears from his broad range of interests, was a typical scholar and writer of the early Peripatetic school. Theophrastos and P. were almost the same age, they were friends and shared far-reaching scientific interests in biology, botany[6], agriculture and pharmacology, as well as a fascination for the "humanities", for instance for the lives of individuals and human behaviour in general, cultural and local history, the history of literature, chronological questions as well as philosophy. In the first generation after Aristotle his disciples began to form groups within the Peripatos based on personal sympathy or antipathy, which had some influence on their scientific interests and published work. One can for instance group Aristoxenos with Dikaiarchos and Theophrastos with Eudemos. Although P. was on friendly terms with Theophrastos, he should not be counted as a member of any of these factions within the Peripatos because of his distance from the regular daily life of the school[7]. P. and Theophrastos exchanged letters, in which they discussed scholarly problems, their lives as teachers, subjects for lectures and means of giving instruction[8]. Theophrastos once remarked in a letter to P. that he regarded ἀναγνῶσεις (reading drafts of his works to his pupils) as helpful in improving his scientific works and in preparing them for final

---

alexandrinische Biographie erstreckte sich auf die ἐν παιδείᾳ διαλάμψαντες, auf die *viri in litteris illustres*, diese versteht man von jetzt an unter den ἔνδοξοι, den *illustres*". But even in the case of books entitled *About Illustrious Men* "we remain in doubt whether they were a series of short biographies or a collection of anecdotes about illustrious men". (Momigliano 1993: 71). The observation may be of general interest for the early development of Greek biography. Neanthes is the earliest writer to whom a work with the title Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν is attributed (*FGrHist* 84 F 13). For his life of Themistokles Neanthes used an earlier work by P. as one of his sources. The most important themes and some characteristic features of later, more developed biographies, such as the scope of the author to describe his heroes' lives "from the cradle to the grave", his lineage and birth, his name, his education under important teachers, his pupils, his old age and death, can already be found in the fragments of Neanthes.

[6] Cf. Phainias Περὶ φυτῶν (or Φυτῶν ἱστορία ?) F 36-50 Wehrli IX. As a scholarly discipline ancient Greek botany perhaps reached its peak with Theophrastos and P. They did not confine themselves to collecting an enormous amount of knowledge on all aspects of nature, but tried to develop a scientific classification for the species of plants (cf. F 37 and F 39 Wehrli IX). In addition P.'s intense practical interest in agricultural problems is attested in F 29, 40, 41, 43 Wehrli IX. Meyer I (1854: 189-193) gives an interpretation of P.'s botanical fragments.

[7] See on these groups e.g. Brink (1940: 921-922).

[8] Cf. Diog. Laert. 5,2,37 following Glotz (1920: 202) who proposed the emendation δεικτηρίου, that is a school room where Theophrastos gave his lectures (but see also Wyse's emendation διδασκαλίου), and 5,2,50 = T 3 and T 4; Schol. Apoll. Rhod. A 972a = T 5.

publication[9]. It is attested that Theophrastos had many pupils[10] in Athens during the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron, and before the law of Sophokles, son of Amphikleides of Sunion, was passed. This law, which dates from 307/6 B.C., restricted philosophical teaching to those philosophers who had been given permission to teach by the assembly and the council of Athens. We do not know the exact number or the names of P.'s pupils. In general Aristotle himself and most of the early Peripatetics, such as Demetrios of Phaleron and Theophrastos, had a dislike of 4th-century Athenian democracy, which was revived after 307 B.C., and indeed, the majority of Athenian democrats were convinced that Peripatetic philosophers were all sworn enemies of democracy. However, we have no clear-cut testimonies on P.'s views on the advantages and faults of certain systems of government[11], and it is unwarranted to speculate on this point on the basis of the opinions held by his teacher Aristotle or his friend Theophrastos.

In view of P.'s prolific writings and his wide range of interests, Plutarch aptly calls him (in F 19) an ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος καὶ γραμμάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος ἱστορικῶν. On the whole, he seems to have excelled in the fields of science and the humanities rather than in purely philosophical research. Nevertheless P. deserves his place as a philosophical writer by virtue of his works on Aristotle's philosophy of knowledge, which were probably three in number: Κατηγορίαι, Περὶ ἑρμενείας and Ἀναλυτικά[12]. Two other philosophical works, Πρὸς Διόδορον[13] and Πρὸς τοὺς σοφιστάς[14], are early examples of the genre of the philosophical ἀντιγραφή or polemical treatise[15].

---

[9] T 4; see also WEHRLI (1969c: 27).

[10] DIOG. LAERT. 5,2,37 gives the probably exaggerated total number of 2000 students in the Peripatos under Theophrastos, but there can be no doubt that the Peripatos prospered during these years, see WEHRLI (1983: 462-464); for the *Law of Sophokles* see DIOG. LAERT. 5,2,37 = T 4 and ATHEN. 13,610f with FERGUSON (1911: 104) and recently HABICHT (1995: 81), who also makes important general remarks on the philosophical schools (1995: 111-116).

[11] But P. certainly had a dislike of tyranny, see below F 1-2 *On the Tyrants in Sicily* and F 3-6 *Tyrants killed in Revenge*.

[12] But we are not sure whether F 8 WEHRLI IX actually refers to three different works under these titles. If so, P. perhaps confined himself to explaining the doctrines and commenting on Aristotle's teachings, as did Eudemos and Theophrastos, who are named along with P. in this passage.

[13] F 9 WEHRLI IX *Against Diodoros (Kronos?)*.

[14] F 10 WEHRLI IX *Against the Sophists*.

[15] The earliest example of a political ἀντιγραφή is a reply by a Sicilian orator named ARISTOTELES to ISOKRATES' Πανηγυρικός with a defence of the Sicilian tyrant Dionysios I of Syracuse under the title Ἀντιγραφὴ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσοκράτους πανηγυρικόν (DIOG. LAERT. 5,1,35); six examples of Aristotelian ἀντιγραφαί are mentioned by WEHRLI (1969c: 29) in his commentary on PHAINIAS F 10.

From the fragments of P.'s works it is clear that some of them consisted in many books. Voluminous works are characteristic of the early Peripatetic writers as well as an enormous literary production, of which only scanty fragments and testimonies have been handed down to us. The focus of scholarly interest had shifted from philosophical research in the field of metaphysics to the sciences and ethics in the broad contemporary sense. Historians of Greek philosophy have observed some weak points in the ontology and transcendental philosophy of the first Peripatetics after Aristotle[16]. The Academy or the Stoa taught more elaborate doctrines in these traditional philosophical fields. Wehrli, a leading modern authority on the history of the early Peripatos, has pointed out a tendency towards philosophical disintegration through the plurality of opinions in the Peripatos, a dangerous process of autonomy of research in the different scientific fields and a lack of great *Syntheseis* or philosophical *summae*[17]. The beginning of this development, which turned out to be a serious competitive disadvantage for the Peripatos against other Hellenistic philosophical schools, can be observed in the numerous fields of scholarly research covered by P., and in the number and contents of his attested works.

According to Aristotle a man is characterized by what he says, what he does and how he lives[18]. Thus he described the most important ways of life (βίοι) and assessed their relative merits[19]: the philosophical life of contemplation (θεωρία) was the best. The life devoted to public and political activity came next in order as the second best, and the life of luxury and pleasure was regarded by the philosopher as the worst form. From these three βίοι a multitude of literary forms illustrating exemplary βίοι sprang up in the first generation after Aristotle's death. There were ἐγκώμια and ψόγοι, historical and political

---

16 See, e.g. Brink (1940: 921): "Neben der Weite und Intensität der empirischen Forschung, neben der kraftvollen ethisch-rhetorischen Einwirkung auf die große Schar der Gebildeten, fallen die eigentlich philosophischen Leistungen der ersten Generation völlig ab. Das hat binnen kurzem zum Ruin der Schule geführt".

17 Cf. Wehrli (1983: 464).

18 Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 4,7,5-6 1127 a 27-28: Ἕκαστος δὲ οἷος ἐστίν, τοιαῦτα λέγει καὶ πράττει καὶ οὕτω ζῇ, ἐὰν μή τινος ἕνεκα πράττῃ: "But when a man is acting without ulterior motive, his words, actions, and conduct always represent his true character", transl. Rackham (1926); further references to the Aristotelian method of deriving a man's character from his sayings and deeds were collected by Leo (1901); see esp. on Phainias Leo (1901: 109-113) and recently Camassa (1994: 303-332, esp. 316). The method is not an Aristotelian invention, but was already used by earlier authors, cf. Xen. *Ages.* 1,6 or Isokr. *Euag.* 65.

19 Cf. Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 1,5,2-8 1095 b 17-1096 a 10.

treatises concentrating on individual *exempla*, and even single or collective biographies. Biographical *exempla historica* of individuals (but also of whole cities and peoples) were often used for the practical purposes of teaching moral philosophy and rhetoric. Therefore it is not surprising that a disciple of Aristotle and a philosopher like P. should make some literary experiments with biographical material in different genres.

On the basis of some of the preserved fragments two observations impose themselves, firstly, that P. wrote early forms of collective Peripatetic biographies, and secondly, that he did not limit himself to biographical material relevant to the lives of famous philosophers, writers or scholars, but was evidently interested in the lives of famous statesmen too (e.g. the Sicilian and other Greek tyrants, Solon or Themistokles). However, it might be too sweeping a statement to call P. an early writer of political biographies. For neither Plutarch nor anybody else tells us that P. actually wrote a biography of Themistokles or of any other historical figure, e.g. Solon. Momigliano (among other scholars) has stressed the difficulty in distinguishing fragments from early collections of anecdotes about individuals from those taken from formal biographies[20]. Perhaps we today are the first to add up the many interesting episodes from Themistokles' life which Plutarch has taken from P. to establish some kind of early formal biography of that statesman. But we can at least say that P. contributed such a large number of episodes, sayings or characteristic deeds from different periods of the lives of some political men that his material covered their entire lifetimes. In the case of Themistokles P. began with a discussion of the lineage of his mother and continued his remarks through to his last years of exile in Magnesia. The view that P. wrote a biography of Themistokles rests, however, on two assumptions which cannot be demonstrated to be true. The first is that all our preserved fragments of P. concerning the life of the statesman come from one and the same work, and the second that all these anecdotes and episodes were linked together within a biographical framework by P. himself and not just later by Plutarch. For if Plutarch took his episodes concerning Themistokles from different works of P., it becomes difficult to imagine a formal biography among these sources. But because of his works *On the Tyrants of Sicily, Tyrants Killed in Revenge,*

---

[20] Cf. Momigliano (1993: 77-78): "In the present state of our knowledge it would be absurd to deny altogether that Phainias wrote biographies; but it is a waste of time to try to guess what sort of biography Phainias may have written, since we cannot be certain that there even was biography by Phainias." (78)

On the Socratics, On Poets and the fragments on Solon and Themistokles, P. must in any case be regarded as an important figure in the development of Greek biography.

Whatever his contributions, there can be no doubt that other early Peripatetics, such as Aristoxenos, Dikaiarchos and Chamaileon, had a more profound influence on the development of Peripatetic literary history, doxography and biography than P. Looking back from imperial times, Suetonius mentioned as representative writers of early Greek biography Hermippos, Satyros, Antigonos and Aristoxenos[21]. Theophrastos, too, is less important for the history of early Hellenistic biography. He made some biographical remarks in works on non-biographical topics, e.g. Περὶ Κωμῳδίας, and used biographical material in his treatise Χαρακτῆρες ἠθικοί[22]. Aristoxenos and Dikaiarchos, unlike Theophrastos, tried to find historical and contemporary examples of the Aristotelian βίοι and to narrate the individual lives of historical figures as personifications of certain types of character. This literary form turned out to be very promising and ultimately led to Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*. Dikaiarchos extended the basic idea and was thus able to declare even a whole people as representative of a certain βίος. He wrote important works on ways of life[23] as well as his famous Βίος Ἑλλάδος, the first known Greek cultural history conceived along evolutionary lines[24]. Aristoxenos and the Περὶ βίων of Klearchos can be dated some years later than Dikaiarchos[25].

The following commentary will concentrate on those fragments of the works of P. that are of interest for a collection of fragments on Greek biography[26]. Given the fragmentary condition of all these works, it may ultimately be impossible to determine whether some of them come closer to the historiographical genos or derive from early examples of the Peripatetic genre of collective biographies. The sample of

---

[21] Cf. ARISTOXENOS F 10 b WEHRLI II = *FGrHist* IV A 2 1016; but this is of course not an exhaustive list.

[22] See STEINMETZ I-II (1960-1962), STEIN (1992) and LANE FOX (1996: 127-170).

[23] Cf. DIKAIARCHOS F 25-46 WEHRLI I = *FGrHist* IV B and C.

[24] Cf. DIKAIARCHOS F 47-66 WEHRLI I = *FGrHist* IV B and C.

[25] KLEARCHOS F 37-62 WEHRLI III = *FGrHist* IV A 2 1021. See on P. and the Περὶ βίων-works of the early Peripatetics LEO (1901: 109-114) and WEHRLI's commentaries on KLEARCHOS F 37-62 (1969a: 58-67) and HERAKLEIDES PONTIKOS F 45 WEHRLI VII (1969b: 72); see also DIHLE (1970: 71-76).

[26] Some of the following texts were already indicated by JACOBY for inclusion in *FGrHist* IV A in his handwritten notes for the preparation of IV A p. 998 (microfilm KU Leuven).

P. examined in this volume includes fragments taken from Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ τυράννων (= F 1-2), Τυράννων ἀναιρέσις ἐκ τιμορίας (= F 3-6), Πρυτάνεις Ἐρεσίων (= F 7-10), Περὶ τῶν Σωκρατικῶν (F 11-12), Περὶ ποιητῶν (F 13) and some fragments from one or several different historical or biographical works on Solon (F 14-16), Themistokles (F 17-22) and Athenian genealogy (F 23).

Commentary on F 1-13

1. ON THE TYRANTS OF SICILY

(1; 2 ?) Tyranny suggested itself to P. as a theme for research. It was not simply a matter of abstract philosophical and ethical discussion. According to Plutarch (T 7) P. and Theophrastos agreed in their opposition to tyranny as a form of government and to individual tyrants; he names them with other philosophers who had helped eject tyrants from their native cities. Three brothers, Apollodoros, Hermon and Heraios came to power in Eresos in the 340's (or about 338 B.C.) when P. was a young man and still living there. They ruled together in an interesting collective form of tyranny organized by members of the same family[27]. In 334 Alexander removed them from power along with other oligarchs and tyrants. According to Arrian[28], Pharnabazos and Autophradates, two admirals of the Persian commander-in-chief Memnon, captured Lesbos during the war against Alexander in 333 B.C. and made Diogenes, who had been exiled from his native city some time before, tyrant in Mytilene, Aristonikos tyrant in Methymna, and Agonippos and Eurysilaos tyrants in Eresos. These tyrannies were overthrown anew by the Macedonians in 333/2 or 332/1 B.C. and from 332 B.C. on democratic systems of constitution prevailed in the city-states of Lesbos[29]. During his life-time P. thus had ample opportunity to become interested in the lives of indi-

---

[27] Cf. *IG* XII[2], 526 on Apollodoros, Hermon and Heraios; on the historical context and the disputed chronology of the various tyrannies in Eresos, see PISTORIUS (1913: 51-76, especially 72-76), BERVE (1967: 336-338) LOTT, (1996: 26-40) and LABARRE (1996: 23-34); on some of Plato's pupils who became tyrants and for interesting parallel collective systems of tyranny organized by members of the same family or by ἑταῖροι, see TRAMPEDACH (1994).

[28] ARR. *Anab.* 2,1,5.

[29] ARR. *Anab.* 3,2,3-7 with commentaries by BOSWORTH (1980: 266-269); on Agonippos and Eurysilaos see TOD *GHI* II 191, lines 129-131 and BOSWORTH (1980: 268); CURTIUS RUFUS 4,5,13-22, esp. 19 with commentaries by ATKINSON (1980: 327-332).

vidual tyrants and in tyranny as a form of constitution. P. had not accompanied Theophrastos to Athens in 335 when he went there to study in the recently founded Peripatos. Hence we cannot entirely exclude the possibility that he actually took part in expelling one of the Lesbian tyrants in 334 or 333/2 B.C.

Now it is Plutarch's purpose in his treatise entitled *That Epikuros Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* to defend the Academic and Peripatetic philosophers against accusations of having consorted with tyrants and monarchs. At the same time Plutarch wished to attack the Epicurean philosophy of withdrawal from political life. Thus the political activities of Theophrastos and P. and their participation in ejecting the tyrants in Eresos on Lesbos may have been exaggerated. Aristotle is credited by the *Vita Aristotelis Marciana* (T 6) with having won favour with P.'s native city because he persuaded Philip II not to lay siege to Eresos. Given Philip's foreign policy it is not easy, however, to imagine when and under what circumstances he might have threatened the city of Eresos or the whole island of Lesbos with a siege before 336 B.C. The whole story is probably a later invention in favour of Philip, who actually gave no support to democracy at Eresos. If not, then one might consider the reign of Alexander (instead of his father Philip II) and his war against Memnon and the Persian fleet in the Aegean as a possible historical context for this story.

P. wrote two works dealing with different aspects of tyranny and tyrants, *On the Tyrants of Sicily* and *Tyrants Killed in Revenge*. The fragments of both works are of interest for a collection of fragments on the roots of Greek biography. *On the Tyrants of Sicily* was perhaps a biographical work, but may equally have been a large collection of characteristic anecdotes. P. was among the first Greek authors to treat rulers as a class apart from philosophers, the representatives of learning and the arts[30]. Moreover, the assessment of different forms of personal rule also constituted a central theme in Sicilian historiography, and hence biographical passages on Sicilian tyrants and even lists of good and bad rulers can be found in general histories of Sicily and the Western Greeks, the Σικελικά[31]. In addition, there were some historical monographs on individual Sicilian tyrants, e.g. those by

[30] Cf. STUART (1928: 132-133 and 162).

[31] Cf. *FGrHist* 554-577 with valuable commentaries by JACOBY; the recent scholarly discussion on Timaios and other authors of general histories of Sicily can be found in PEARSON (1987), VATTUONE (1991), SORDI (1992) and SCHEPENS (1994).

Polykritos, Kallias or Antandros[32]. In Hellenistic times an impressive literature *On Kings* and on individual kings of particular states existed, which may partly have been influenced by P.'s *On the Tyrants of Sicily*[33]. Cooper recently surmised that P. arranged *On the Tyrants of Sicily* in the form of a political διαδοχή[34]. But, at least in the preserved fragments, there are only insufficient hints indicating the concept of succession from earlier to later tyrants or a theory of historical development of tyranny as a form of rule, either of which one would expect to find as the leading idea in such a διαδοχή.

Similarities between P.'s *On the Tyrants of Sicily* and Hieronymos of Kardia's Ἡ περὶ τῶν ἐπιγόνων πραγματεία (or Τὰ ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πραχθέντα) have been suggested[35], but the most commensurable work could have been Baton of Sinope's *On the Tyrants of Ephesos*[36]. Unfortunately, however, only two fragments from Baton's work have survived, and we should not base important conclusions on mere similarities in the attested titles. Baton, however, also treated the topic of tyranny in a second work entitled *On the Tyranny of Hieronymos*[37]. The *Tyrants who lived in Europe and Asia* by Charon of Carthage[38] is also known to us only as a title. These works are, moreover, to be dated later than those of P. and therefore cannot give us decisive clues as to the character of P.'s *On the Tyrants of Sicily*.

(1) Athenaios remarks that P. told the same story as Theopompos. Hence Wehrli has provided the complete context of the quotation from P. including the long fragment of Theopompos (*FGrHist* 115 F 193) as his F 11. Only the first eight lines and the end of the fragment are, however, to be regarded with certainty as a direct quotation from P., whereas the remainder is a quotation from Theopompos, which

---

[32] Cf. Polykritos *FGrHist* 559 F 1, Kallias *FGrHist* 564 F 1-7, Antandros *FGrHist* 565 T 5 and F 1.

[33] Cf. Nymphis *FGrHist* 432 T 1 and F 17, Charon of Naukratis *FGrHist* 612 T 1, Nikandros of Kalchedon *FGrHist* 700 F 1-2, Demetrios *FGrHist* 722 F 1-6, Eupolemos *FGrHist* 723 F 1-4, Iustus of Tiberias *FGrHist* 734 F 1-3 and Menander of Ephesos *FGrHist* 783 F 1-6; Timagenes *FGrHist* 88 F 1 probably took a series of kings as the chronological structure of his universal history.

[34] Cf. Cooper (1995: 329).

[35] Hieronymos of Kardia *FGrHist* 154 F 13; but see Hornblower (1981) on the structure of Hieronymos' work.

[36] *FGrHist* 268 F 2-3; see already Laqueur (1938: 1567). See forthcoming commentary on FGrHist IV A 4 1028.

[37] Cf. Baton *FGrHist* 268 F 4.

[38] *Suda* X 137 *s.v.* Χάρων (cf. *FGrHist* IV A 7); he probably lived before 146 B.C., but a later date after the refoundation of Carthage by Caesar cannot be ruled out.

we cannot be sure that P. himself knew. We cannot rule out the possibility that P. took the whole story from the Chian historiographer, but because of the peculiar composite character of the passage in Athenaios, it is not possible to use F 1 as a typical example of P.'s style in *On the Tyrants of Sicily*.

The proverbial wealth and luxury of the Sicilian tyrants was illustrated by P. by means of their expensive votive offerings, which were made of gold and silver and displayed in the Panhellenic sanctuary of Delphi, and in his description of the splendid life at their Sicilian courts. P. reminded his readers of the frugality of the offerings made to Delphi in earlier times. Gyges, king of the Lydians, was the first to send offerings made of gold and silver. He was imitated by Kroisos and the Sicilian tyrants Gelon and Hieron[39]. In *On the Tyrants of Sicily* P. may have criticized the extreme luxury of life and the show of wealth made in Delphi for purposes of propaganda by foreign rulers from a philosophical point of view, but there is no explicit criticism in the present fragment[40]. P. quoted two epigrams from "old" votive offerings in Delphi to embellish his narrative and to give it greater authority. But these epigrams should not be regarded as genuine, as Wehrli has rightly emphasized in his commentary.

(2) Wehrli was unsure whether the fragment should be assigned to *On the Tyrants of Sicily* or to *On Poets*[41]. Judging by its content it could fit into both works. The fragment illustrates the luxury displayed at the court and the table of Dionysios I and his relationship to famous poets whom he tried to attract to his court[42]. F 2 relates a typical anecdote about the poet Philoxenos, but one should also keep in mind the Sicilian sojourns of Aischylos or Pindaros as topics possibly dealt with by P. Philoxenos, a famous dithyrambic poet from Kythera (c. 435/34-380/79 B.C.) and a composer of music regarded by his contemporaries as quite innovative, stayed for some years with Dionysios in Syracuse as his court poet[43]. During that time he dared to

---

[39] For a brief account of Gelon and Hieron see BERVE (1967: 140-152); for the current scholarly views on the early tyranny in Syracuse see MADDOLI in: GABBA and VALLET II,1 (1980: 34-54).

[40] On the votive offerings in Delphi see MAASS (1993: 126-184); on the early bronze statuettes of the eighth century which were dedicated, among others, by the Corinthians, see ROLLEY (1969).

[41] Cf. F 32-33 WEHRLI IX and see the commentary below on F 13.

[42] Cf. SORDI (1992: 63; 83-84; 147).

[43] For Philoxenos' works cf. PAGE (1962), esp. PHAINIAS F 7 = PHILOXENOS F 3 (816) PAGE; see also CAVEN (1990: 223-224).

criticize the tyrant's attempts at writing tragedies. For this reason he was thrown into the quarries near Syracuse. The dialogue between poet and tyrant in P. may have been a prelude to the account of Philoxenos' catastrophe. The fragment is of some interest for P.'s style, which was lively, and betrayed a fondness of rich detail and pointed anecdotes. P. was primarily interested in the character and personal qualities of Dionysios I and his relationship with Philoxenos, not in evaluating his political or military role[44].

2. TYRANTS KILLED IN REVENGE

(3-6) Aristotle himself had discussed legitimate grounds for expelling or even killing an unjust ruler or a tyrant in his Πολιτικά[45]. Thus a work entitled *Tyrants killed in Revenge* fits perfectly into the Peripatetic tradition, and one may presume that P. wished to illustrate the theories of his master with examples taken from history. F 3-6 are of great interest for a collection of fragments on the roots of Greek biography. They confirm Momigliano's view that P. (like his teacher Aristotle) did not cross the bridge from collecting anecdotes to writing formal biographies[46]. Aristotle had made a characteristically subtle distinction between assaults on the life of rulers and tyrants and violent attempts to change the form of government. According to the philosopher most assaults on the lives of rulers result from acts of ὕβρις committed by these rulers against the honour, the fortune or the body of one of their subjects, their relatives or their lovers. In most cases assaults on the lives of such insolent rulers or tyrants come from those injured by the acts of hybris in question; they seek to take *private* revenge by killing the wrongdoers. Aristotle himself had named Harmodios and Aristogeiton, the famous Athenian pair of lovers, or the man who killed Periandros as typical examples. A similar story is told of Hipparinos and Antileon in F 5. P. systematically collected historical examples of violent revenge against tyrants or rulers and did not confine himself to dividing his material into categories, but told his stories in an entertaining and lively way. Consequently, he had to concentrate on the direct cause of the violent revenge, the way it was sought and the immediate consequences of the assault. It was neither

---

[44] On Dionysios I of Syracuse see Beloch III,2 (1923^2: 185-209), Stroheker (1958), Berve (1967: 222-260), Sanders (1987), von Ungern – Sternberg (1988: 1123-1151) and Sordi (1992).

[45] Cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 5,10,1311a31-1313a15.

[46] Cf. Momigliano (1993: 76 on Aristotle and 78 on P.).

necessary nor expedient for P. to provide a historical narrative of the whole reign of every tyrant mentioned in his work. Thus in all probability *Tyrants killed in Revenge* was not a collective biography of tyrants, but a vast and systematically arranged compilation of concrete historical examples of violent acts of revenge and anecdotes related to them. In collecting his examples P. did not restrict himself to a given part of the Greek world or use examples taken exclusively from the older tyranny of the 7th and 6th centuries, but included contemporary examples, too.

(3) Skopas is often named as an example in connection with enormous wealth, splendid ostentation and tyrannical insolence. He lived in the second half of the sixth century B.C. and was a dynast or tyrant in the Thessalian town of Krannon[47], or, according to some more reliable ancient authorities, at Pharsalos[48]. His exact constitutional position is anything but clear[49]. But Skopas, son of Kreon, was the head of the dynastic clan of the Skopads. One may describe him as one of the Thessalian "tyrants", but he may also have been an elected τάγος, that is a constitutional warlord (or "duke") of all Thessalians.

In the present text his notorious alcoholic excesses, his hybris and complete disregard for his fellow-citizens' opinion of his shocking behaviour are stressed by P. Skopas gave orders that four servants should carry him back from drinking parties sitting on his throne, since he was usually too drunk to walk. One can conclude from the only extant fragment on Skopas that P. described him in a very negative way. In the eyes of a philosopher like P. and according to ancient Greek popular morality a man (and in particular a ruler) made himself a laughing-stock and lost his reputation, if he was seen completely drunk in public. But Skopas even seems to have made a show of his deplorable condition. Thrones were ceremonial seats that should be reserved, according to most 4th-century Greeks, for the statues of the gods, for priests or for rulers and magistrates when they were exercising their religious or political functions. Skopas' insolence is dramatically demonstrated by the fact that he had himself carried home on his throne while drunk.

---

[47] Cf. Apollas *FGrHist* 266 F 6; Kallim. *Aet.* F 64,11ss Pfeiffer; Cic. *De or.* 2,86 and 2,157.

[48] Cf. Quint. *Inst. or.* 11,2,11 (following Simonides) and Apollodoros *FGrHist* 244 F 67, Eratosthenes *FGrHist* 241 F 34, Euphorion F 55 Scheidweiler and other parallel sources.

[49] See Berve I (1967: 183-184).

The insolence of Skopas described in F 3 in all likelihood builds up to the description (not handed down to us) of the revenge killing of Skopas by the gods. As we know from other sources Skopas and his family were killed in a terrible accident, when the ceiling of the dining-room in their palace suddenly collapsed[50].The court poet Simonides was one of the few lucky survivors of this famous disaster. He thought that the Dioscuri had saved him because he had celebrated them in a victory song, just before the catastrophe occurred. Skopas had given Simonides only half of the sum he had promised him for this victory song. When Simonides had asked Skopas to give him the full amount, the insolent tyrant had uttered a blasphemous joke and advised the poet to ask the two sons of Zeus for the rest of the money. The sudden death of Skopas and his family was an ideal theme for P. He doubtless explained the catastrophe as the sentence of the gods for the insolence and blasphemy of the tyrant. The disaster of the Skopads remained well-known in the Greek and Roman world due to the fame of Simonides[51] and his association with Skopas. The example of Skopas in F 3 differs from the example in F 5, because the accident in the palace of the Scopads and the revenge are not described in the text of F 3 and, moreover, the revenge does not come from a man injured by the tyrant, but from the divine twin sons themselves. But it can hardly be doubted that P. described the disaster of the Skopads in the wider context of F 3. He may also have related earlier assaults on Skopas by his injured Thessalian subjects in this context, but this is not a necessary assumption. Since even cases of "divine revenge" were included by P., one can surmise the wide thematic scope of his work and the correspondingly large number of historical examples he gave.

(4) In F 4 P. likewise illustrates the Aristotelian doctrine of tyrants by giving examples. Aristotle had pointed to the fact that an important office, a τιμή (such as the position of an αἰσυμνήτης, ἄρχων or στρατηγός), could be used as a stepping-stone by future tyrants, but that many other tyrants had simply been leading demagogues in a Greek

---

50 Cf. Cic. *De or.* 2,86 and 2,157; Quint. *Inst. or.* 11,2,11 = Simonides F 5 (510) Page.

51 See Bowra (1934: 230-239) and Wehrli's commentary on his F 14 with references to Plat. *Prot.* 339a-346d = Simonides F 4 Diehl = F 37 (542) Page taken from a σκόλιον probably entitled *On Skopas, son of Kreon, the Thessalian* and Stob. *Ecl.* 4,41,9 Hense = F 6 Diehl = F 16 (521) Page; see also Diehl's and Page's important notes on a *threnos* Εἰς τοὺς Σκοπάδας.

city-state without holding a constitutional office (ἐκ δημαγωγίας)[52]. We should also not forget that quite a number of Academic (and some Peripatetic) philosophers had given up their life of theoretical reflexion to become tyrants. We know of a special treatise on such individuals, namely Hermippos of Smyrna's Περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς <τυραννίδας καὶ> δυναστείας μεθεστηκότων[53].

It is not known when and where Philoxenos rose up from the position of σωληνιστής (simple fisherman) and demagogue to become a tyrant. Since P. indicates that Philoxenos made a fortune as a merchant and a trader before he became tyrant, one is led to think that he used his wealth as well as his demagogic qualities to obtain the tyranny. Berve[54] surmises that Philoxenos ruled in a city on the coast of Asia Minor, probably in the 4th century, but there is no evidence as to the exact time or place. One may presume that P. furnished his readers with further information on Philoxenos, especially on his violent death through revenge. The life of Philoxenos would have been of equal interest to a Greek biographer, historian and philosopher: it illustrated the chances offered by the position of leading demagogue as a stepping-stone to tyranny and could be used as a salutary example of what happens to those who rise too quickly on the social scale. One might compare the great interest philosophically trained biographers took in the rise and fall of Hermias of Atarneus, a prominent tyrant in Atarneus and Assos (in Asia Minor) in the 4th century, who was Aristotle's father-in-law (or the brother of his father-in-law) and, according to some sources, himself a pupil of Plato[55].

(5) F 5 comes from Parthenios of Nikaia. He came as a captive of war to Rome in the first century B.C., but was soon given his freedom. As a freedman he wrote Ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα in prose and some elegies. Parthenios lived for many years in Rome and Naples. He had a considerable influence on some neoteric poets such as Gallus and was on friendly terms with famous contemporary poets (even with Virgil).

---

52 Cf. e.g. ARISTOT. *Pol.* 5,10,4 1310b 25-31.

53 Cf. HERMIPPOS F 89-91 WEHRLI Suppl. I = *FGrHist* IV A 3 1026 F 39-40 BOLLANSÉE.

54 BERVE I (1967: 340).

55 On Hermias see recently TRAMPEDACH (1994: 66-79). If Hermias of Atarneus was indeed a eunuch, as some ancient sources state (STRAB. *Geogr.* 13,1,57 C. 610 and DIOG. LAERT. 5,1,3 following Demetrios of Magnesia), Aristotle must have married his brother's daughter. There is another, not very trustworthy, version of this story by Aristippos, that the woman was a beautiful concubine of Hermias.

Parthenios[56] may have served as an intermediary source between P. and Claudius Aelianus for this story[57].

The story of Antileon and Hipparinos, two lovers from Herakleia in southern Italy, is closely paralleled by a story from Metapontion, to which Aristotle alludes in his *Eudemian Ethics*. The philosopher writes[58]: "For if a man is in love he is more daring than cowardly, and endures many dangers, like the man who murdered the tyrant in Metapontion and the person in Crete in the story." While we cannot identify the anonymous "man of Crete", Plutarch[59] in his treatise Ἐρωτικός provides us with the decisive piece of evidence about Antileon of Metapontion and Aristogeiton of Athens (the latter of whom killed Hipparchos the son of Peisistratos) from which it is clear that these are two stock examples of lovers who dared to kill mighty tyrants out of injured love. Both stories may have originated from one and the same assault made by a lover named Antileon. In Parthenios' version Antileon is a citizen of Herakleia, but Kassel did not regard this difference as an important obstacle for his identification of the two[60]. Herakleia and Metapontion were neighbouring towns and they may have quarreled for centuries over which of them rightly deserved the honour of being the famous tyrant-slayer's home town.

Wehrli, however, gives three reasons for his opinion that Parthenios, following P., tells the original version of the story and that the violent act of revenge took place in Herakleia on the Siris. This city is less well-known than Metapontion. The bronze statues of the two lovers were erected in this town and the aetiological story of the law against binding sheep together is connected with Herakleia. The name of the tyrant slain is not given in the text of Parthenios, but there is a marginal note to the text in one manuscript to the effect that his name was possibly Archelaos[61]. Berve tentatively dated the story between the killing of Phalaris of Akragas by Melanippos (ca. 570-554 B.C.) and Aristogeiton's assault on Hipparchos in Athens in 514 B.C.

---

56 On Parthenios' poetical works see Diehl (1942: 94-101); on the sad love-stories related by Parthenios, see Martini (1902: esp. 52-53); there is also an English translation with very short notes by Stern (1992: 17 and 81).

57 Cf. Ael. *Var. hist.* F 70 Hercher = F 73a-f Domingo – Forasté.

58 Aristot. *Eth. Eud.* 3,1,17 1229a 21-24, transl. Rackham (1935); see Wehrli's commentary on F 16; also Berve I (1967: 159) and II (1967: 610-611).

59 Plut. *Amatorius* 760c.

60 Cf. Kassel (1974: 190-191).

61 Cf. Berve II (1967: 610-611).

Possibly P. knew the two concurring stories about Antileon as a tyrant-slayer coming from either Herakleia or from Metapontion. P. was probably the first Peripatetic to illustrate his master's hint in the *Eudemian Ethics* with the story of Hipparinos and Antileon. If so, it is a significant fact that P. who was aptly characterized by Plutarch as a philosopher and as well-read in history besides (cf. F 19) did not follow Aristotle's location of the story, but preferred the version of Herakleia. In spite of his decision the alternative story located in Metapontion remained current until Roman imperial times. This story related by P. also testifies to his interest in prosopographical detail and the local traditions of Sicilian and southern Italian towns. Such interest is equally revealed in his local chronicle of his native city Eresos entitled *The Prytaneis of Eresos* (see below F 7-10).

(6) Mekler's edition of 1902, which provided the basis for HERMIPPOS F 89 WEHRLI S I, has now been superseded by Gaiser's and Dorandi's recent editions of Philodemos. Dorandi's text is a model of philological and papyrological caution and correctness, but I shall make use of Gaiser's valuable conjectures as well for a tentative reconstruction of the second part of the fragment. Gaiser's and Bollansée's valuable commentaries should be used to supplement Dorandi's brief remarks[62]. The new editions of P.Herc. 1021 and 164 by Dorandi and Gaiser have altered our assessment of the entire character of Philodemos' work. P.Herc. 1021 and 164, far from constituting a mere *Index of Academic philosophers* have turned out, despite the numerous *lacunae,* to be "eine biographisch angelegte, im wesentlichen aus Exzerpten früherer Schriften bestehende Darstellung der platonischen Schule von Platon bis in die eigene Zeit Philodems"[63]. They are an important part of Philodemos' great *Syntaxis* of Stoic, Epicurean and Academic philosophers. For the history of biography the exact interpretation of Philodemos' technique of quoting and arranging his material in his *History of the Philosophers* is of prime importance and deserves further intensive study[64].

---

[62] Cf. DORANDI (1991: 143 Greek text; 190 Italian translation; 233 a very brief commentary); GAISER (1988: 222-225 Greek text and German translation; 494-501 commentary on the passages concerning Chairon of Pellene and 123-128 on P. as a source used by Hermippos). See also further references on the papyri from Herculaneum in GIGANTE (1979: 230-233) and an exhaustive commentary in BOLLANSÉE (1996: 355-379) on HERMIPPOS 89 WEHRLI Suppl. I = F 39 BOLLANSÉE.

[63] GAISER (1988: 13).

[64] I intend to devote a separate study to this topic.

Gaiser attempted to fill in the great *lacunae* in P.Herc. 1021 with conjectures based on the reading of P.Herc. 164 and on ancient parallel sources, e.g. from remarks on Chairon of Pellene in Aischines, Pseudo-Demosthenes, Pausanias and Athenaios. The reader should be aware that only col. 12,2-11 of P.Herc. 1021 can be translated and interpreted on the basis of an adequate Greek text. Col. 12,12-21 are so damaged as to be beyond restoration. The Greek text and the German translation proposed by Gaiser are thus to be taken as an educated guess.

Chairon of Pellene is known to have continued his studies as a disciple of the Academy until at least 339 B.C., because it is stated that he was also a pupil of Xenokrates[65]. Between 338 and about 333 B.C. he became an excellent wrestler and according to Pausanias won four impressive Olympic and two other (Isthmian or Pythian?) victories. His rivals did not even dare to fight against him in the wrestling ring and so he won several times ἀκονιτί[66]. Chairon no longer wished to live on a par with his fellow-citizens and to obey the laws, but to rule over them on the only (and, for a Platonic philosopher king, insufficient) basis, that he was of extraordinary physical strength and a victor in several Panhellenic games. Backed by Macedonian military supremacy and with political pressure from Alexander's στρατηγὸς Εὐρώπης Antipater and his mercenary leader Korrhagos[67], Chairon was installed as a pro-Macedonian tyrant in Pellene on the Peloponnese. He became tyrant between 335 and 333 or (at latest) in 331 B.C. The date of the political coup is uncertain and depends on the dating of a speech in the Demosthenic corpus *On the Treaties with Alexander* and the reconstruction of political events in the late 330's on the Peloponnese[68]. Chairon turned out to be an insolent and enterprising tyrant[69] who secured his position by some typically tyrannical meas-

---

[65] On Chairon's political career see KAERST (1899: 2032-2033), CULASSO GASTALDI (1980: 233-242), WÖRLE (1981: 105-111), MARASCO (1985: 111-119) and TRAMPEDACH (1994: 64-65).

[66] On Chairon's victories cf. PAUS. 7,27,7.

[67] On Korrhagos see CLARYSSE and SCHEPENS (1985: 30-47).

[68] Cf. PS.-DEM. 17,10 *On the Treaties with Alexander*; PAUS. 7,27,7: Chairon was made tyrant by king Alexander, that is after 336 B.C.; ATHEN. 11,509a-b yields no certain date, AISCHIN. 3,165 only a *terminus ante quem* of 330 B.C.; P.Herc. col. 11-12 seems to imply a direct connection between the arrival of Korrhagos' forces in the Peloponnesos and Chairon's installation as a tyrant; for a discussion of the chronology, see GAISER (1988: 497-498) and TRAMPEDACH (1994: 64).

[69] Following Dorandi I read νεανικόν in P.Herc. col. 12,7. Far-reaching earlier interpretations based on the reading θεατρικὸν τύραννον, that is, a pretentious tyrant or a tyrant full of ostentation (Mekler), or μανικὸν τύραννον, a crazy tyrant or a

ures[70]. He forced a considerable part of the former citizens (the aristocrats in a social sense or just the "best" in the moral sense?) into exile, radically changed the political constitution of Pellene[71], gave citizen-rights to former slaves and divided the confiscated property of exiled citizens among the new citizens in order to enlarge the number of his supporters. He relied for his military protection on the Macedonian mercenary force of 1000 soldiers under Korrhagos and on the regular Macedonian garrison in Corinth. There is a hostile tradition that Chairon had the wives of citizens marry their husband's former slaves. The charge is explicitly made in the papyrus from Herculaneum[72]. But I take it to be a topos of oratory and philosophy against cruel tyrants.[73] When Agis III stirred up the whole Peloponnese against Macedon, Chairon was able to repay the support he had received from the Macedonians to secure his position in Pellene. For this city stayed loyally on the Macedonian side, although Korrhagos' soldiers were badly beaten at the beginning of the war[74]. This unwavering loyalty is even more remarkable, because Elis and the other Achaians, with the exception of Pellene, now followed Agis. But Antipater's decisive victory over Agis at Megalopolis in 331 B.C. definitively restored Macedonian supremacy. Chairon was now on the victors' side. His position in Pellene was confirmed by Antipater.

The attempt at digging a canal through the Isthmus of Corinth deep and wide enough for the use of ships had been made for the first time, but without success, by Periandros, tyrant of Corinth, in about 600 B.C.[75]. It was fitting for an energetic and enterprising tyrant like Chai-

---

maniac as a tyrant, can be dispensed with now. Dorandi understood the term νεανικόν to be ironical (cf. col. 11,30), but it had already been used by Plato and Aristotle in philosophical contexts in a negative sense meaning headstrong or insolent: cf. PLAT. *Gorg.* 508d and 509a and esp. ARISTOT. *Pol.* 4,11,8 1296a 4: καὶ γὰρ ἐκ δημοκρατίας τῆς νεανικωτάτης καὶ ἐξ ὀλιγαρχίας γίγνεται τυραννίς κτλ.

[70] See esp. ATHEN. 11,509a-b; P.Herc. col. 11,19-12,2.

[71] According to Ps.-DEM. 17,8-10 he abolished a democracy, but Trampedach argues that it was probably a pro-Spartan aristocracy or a "Hoplitenpoliteia".

[72] PHILOD. P.Herc. col. 12,1-2; Philodemos' sources Hermippos and Dikaiarchos took this accusation from earlier democratic Athenian orators such as the speaker of Ps.-DEM. 17. The same accusation was made against other famous tyrants, e.g.: Dionysios I of Syracuse in DIOD. 14,66,5; Klearchos of Herakleia in IUSTIN 16,5,1-4; Nabis of Sparta in POLYB. 16,13,1.

[73] Nonetheless, see MOSSÉ (1969: 184-186) and MARASCO (1985: 113-114) for a different view.

[74] Cf. AISCHIN. 3,165 und DEIN. 1,34.

[75] DIOG. LAERT. 1,99; after Chairon other prominent Greeks and Romans made some more unsuccessful attempts: Demetrios Poliorketes, Caesar, Caius (Caligula), Nero and Herodes Atticus.

ron to renew Periandros' plan, but he too failed to turn the project into reality. Similar large-scale plans by other Greek cities or individual rulers had been criticized by earlier writers as examples of human insolence and as a violation of the natural separation of land and sea[76]. For that reason, there may be an element of criticism in P.'s decision to relate this detail about Chairon. The geographical fact that the territory of Pellene did not reach to the area near Corinth, where a passage through the narrowest part of the isthmus may have been projected, is not a decisive argument against the historicity of such plans. Chairon was one of the most loyal Peloponnesian allies of the Macedonians. They controlled the area around the Isthmus of Corinth with their troops at Akrokorinthos. One could imagine that Chairon directed such a project by appointment of the Macedonians.

A similar argument holds true against the claim, that Chairon could not have planned to found a new city near the Megarian marshes, since the territory of Pellene was limited to a coastal stretch[77]. The Macedonians may have given him additional territory or allowed him to use uninhabited land near the Megarian marshes as a reward for his loyalty in the war against Agis in 331 B.C. *Chaironeia* could, of course, be derived from his own name Chairon. Hence P. may have given the name of the town as an example of Chairon's insolence. Did Chairon wish to imitate Alexander the Great on a smaller scale? Moreover, the name of the new town *Chaironeia* reminded the Greek world of the battle which secured Macedonian supremacy over Greece. This supremacy and Chairon's loyalty to Alexander and Antipater were the preconditions for his rise to tyranny in Pellene and his political survival.

Philodemos' quotation from P. is embedded in a larger quote from Hermippos of Smyrna[78]. Philodemos' technique of combining quotations from several sources raises questions which are difficult to answer. Did Philodemos himself read the original works of all authors

---

[76] Cf., e.g., HERODOT. 1,174 on the unsuccessful plan of the Knidians to turn their peninsula into an island. During the preparation of his campaign against Greece in 480 B.C. Xerxes, however, did succeed in turning his plan of digging a canal through the isthmus at Mount Athos into reality, see HERODOT. 7,22-24; 37 and 122. This enterprise was regarded by the historian Herodotos as Xerxes' second act of insolence after his unnatural bridging of the straits between Europe and Asia.

[77] On the territory of Pellene see MEYER (1937: 358-359).

[78] Cf. PHILOD. P.Herc. col. 10,40-12,20 = HERMIPPOS F 89 WEHRLI Suppl. I = F 39 BOLLANSÉE.

whom he quotes on Chairon, namely Hermippos, P., Dikaiarchos and other anonymous authors called τίνες? Or did he only use the work of Hermippos of Smyrna and cite the earlier authors through the latter? For Chairon's life Philodemos refers by name to Hermippos[79] and P.[80]. But whereas Philodemos certainly read Hermippos' works, some scholars, e.g. recently Gaiser[81], have serious doubts as to whether Philodemos in the first century B.C. directly consulted such rarely read authors as P. On the other hand, one can easily underrate the extent of Philodemos' reading, and there is no convincing argument to rule out the possibility that he knew P.'s original works. The beginning of the passage on Chairon shows that the first few lines of the following text are a direct quotation from Hermippos. But the wording of the papyrus itself does not exclude the possibility that in col. 12,2 which is marked by the beginning of a new sentence, the quotation from Hermippos comes to an end and a new direct quotation from P. follows. Given the mutilated condition of the papyrus after col.12,12 we cannot be sure where the new quotation ends[82].

A second important question to be raised concerns the identification of the work of P. quoted here. Hermippos has given the story of Chairon's tyranny in Pellene in his treatise *On Those who Fell from Philosophy to Tyranny(?) and (the Exercise of) Power*. This title is cited explicitly by Philodemos[83]. Chairon was introduced by Philodemos as a former disciple of the Academy and a pro-Macedonian tyrant of Pellene at the time of Alexander the Great. Chairon was also named in Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai* as an example of a philosopher who had become a tyrant. Athenaios, however, was biased against Plato's pupils[84]. One may presume that the salutary example of Chairon had already been adduced in the influential accusations against the philosophers of Demochares of Leukonoe[85]. Contemporary examples of men who are reported to have listened to Plato's philosophical lec-

---

[79] Philod. P.Herc. col. 11,4.
[80] Philod. P.Herc. col. 12,2.
[81] Gaiser (1988: 127-128).
[82] On the problems involved in defining the size of the fragment from P. see recently Gaiser (1988: 127) and Bollansée (1996: 369-370).
[83] Cf. Hermippos F 89-91 Wehrli Suppl. I = F 39-40 Bollansée and the commentaries by Wehrli (1974: 95-97) and Bollansée (1996: 355-357) on the *lacuna* in the attested title. Perhaps δυναστεία should be understood as a *terminus technicus*. It could mean a form of one-man-rule that was different from a traditional monarchy or a tyranny.
[84] Cf. Athen. 11,507f-509b.
[85] Cf. Gaiser (1988: 121-122).

tures and have become tyrants in their later years include Euaion at Lampsakos, Timolaos at Kyzikos, Hermias at Atarneus and Assos and Klearchos at Herakleia[86]. It is, therefore, not very probable that the fragment on Chairon comes from P.'s *On the Tyrants of Sicily* and was adduced as a Peloponnesian parallel for some Sicilian and western Greek tyrants such as Dionysios I of Syracuse.

Perhaps P. used the episodes from Chairon's life as an historical example to illustrate a certain Aristotelian βίος, the life of the "ambitious man". His victories in several Panhellenic competitions made Chairon a man possessed by ambition. His projects to dig a canal through the Isthmus of Corinth for the use of ships and even to found the new city named Chaironeia are fitting examples of megalomania. P., and following him Hermippos, explained Chairon's urgent desire to become tyrant in Pellene as a consequence of the most striking aspect of his character, namely his ambition. To give way to unlimited ambition was an act of defection from the true philosophic doctrine and way of life. From a philosophical point of view the tenor of the passage is negative.

Chairon was a disciple of the Academy, but his career endangered the position of the Peripatetics in Athens, too. P. tried to defend the Athenian schools of philosophy against accusations that they were a breeding-place of tyrants and sworn enemies of democracy. Hence he had to reject the accusations of the democratic orators that Chairon was a typical product of philosophical education. A fault of character, his ambition, made Chairon desert the ranks of true philosophers. Admittedly, this is only an educated guess inspired by the catchword φιλότιμον in the preserved lines of the text, but if it is correct, P. may have written a treatise in the Peripatetic tradition with the hypothetical title Περὶ φιλοτιμίας. Φιλοτιμία is also a major trait in Themistokles' character as described in some of the fragments taken by Plutarch from P.'s work (or works) on Themistokles. Cooper, however, suggested that F 6 as well as the passages on Themistokles (cf. F 17-22) may come from a διαδοχή and tentatively attributed them to P.'s attested work *Against the Sophists*. But his arguments for this hypothesis are not convincing (see below for the commentary on F 17-22).

As stated above, there is a list in the readable part of the papyrus of several tyrannical and harmful measures which Chairon took to se-

[86] On these see Trampedach (1994: 62-87).

cure his position: he drove many enemies and formerly honorable citizens into exile, gave citizenship to former slaves, confiscated the property of his exiled enemies and is said to have even forced their respectable wives to marry their former slaves[87]. By common Greek standards of ethics each of these measures provided sufficient justification for a violent assault on Chairon. Perhaps the killing of Chairon was described by Philodemos in the following lines of the papyrus, which have been preserved only in a very mutilated condition[88]. At any rate, the preserved passages would fit well into P.'s *Tyrants Killed in Revenge*. Consequently, in spite of some reservations, I have included F 6 among the fragments from this work.

3. THE PRYTANEIS OF ERESOS

(7-10) The number of fragments assigned by Müller, Jacoby and Wehrli to P.'s Πρυτάνεις Ἐρεσίων differed considerably. From such lack of *consensus* one can draw conclusions as to the extent of our ignorance of the character of *The Prytaneis of Eresos*[89]. Jacoby, unlike Wehrli, at first took a further passage from Eustathios of Thessalonike into consideration as a possible fragment of P., but rejected it upon closer examination[90].

Most scholars take *The Prytaneis of Eresos* to be a chronicle arranged according to the succession of the *Prytaneis*, who were the city's lead-

---

87 Philod. P.Herc. col. 11,19-12,2.

88 Cf. Philod. P.Herc. col. 12,17-21.

89 Müller, *FHG* II, p. 294-297 assigned eleven fragments (F 1-11) taken from Plutarch's *Life of Solon* and *Life of Perikles*, some of them of considerable length, to this work, although the fragments have come down to us without any indication as to which of P.'s works they have been drawn from. Thus Müller's collection misleads readers by giving them the impression that *The Prytaneis of Eresos* was P.'s main work and that this chronicle had a broad political and historical scope.

90 In Eust. *Comm. ad Hom. Od.* 11,521 Stallbaum (1825: 432 l. 34) an "Eresios" is mentioned in a list of *mnemones*. Knaack (1907: 420) thought that one should either read the name "Eresos" in this passage instead of "Eresios", or (more probably) that "Eresios" is only the name of the place of birth of an author, whose name has been omitted before "Eresios" in our text. This author from Eresos could—among other candidates—be P. But Jacoby probably would have preferred to assign the whole passage from Eustathios to Ptolemaios Chennos' Καινὴ ἱστορία, whose fragments he planned to collect in *FGrHist* VI together with other "Schwindelautoren"; on Ptolemaios Chennos cf. F 6 Hercher (1856: 269-293, esp. 273 n. 2), Westermann (1843: 184) and Tomberg (1967: 103 and n. 57); on some characteristic features of the *New History* and its general unreliability see Hercher (1856: 275-285) and Tomberg (1967).

ing magistrates[91]. P., as a native Lesbian author, had easy access to an official list of the *Prytaneis* at Eresos. Following the example of Hellanikos of Lesbos' *Priestesses of Hera* and *Victors at the Olympic Games*, many authors wrote chronographic works or chronicles of different cities. It would have been helpful to compare P.'s *The Prytaneis of Eresos* with Charon's Πρυτάνεις οἱ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων[92], if both works had only been preserved in a less fragmentary condition. Among contemporary Peripatetic works Wehrli pointed to Demetrios of Phaleron's Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή[93]. One could also mention the *Lists of Winners at the Pythian Games* drawn up by Aristotle and Kallisthenes[94]. At any rate, P. in *The Prytaneis of Eresos* and in his fragments on Solon (F 15) and Themistokles (F 20) expressed his opinions about relative chronology, discussed synchronisms and even tried to calculate exact dates. Thus he used three types of chronological research which had already been developed some generations before the scientific chronological works of Apollodoros and Eratosthenes.

(7) The thematic scope of Greek chronicles varied greatly[95]. In view of the very few fragments which can be claimed with certainty for *The Prytaneis of Eresos*, it would be bold to attempt a detailed hypothesis on the scope and method of P.'s work. There is only one fragment which has been preserved with the title of the work, namely the present F 7[96]. The type of information we get from this fragment may be considered as characteristic of certain Greek and Roman chronicles. All sorts of political events, likewise natural catastrophes, such as earthquakes, excessive rains, periods of draught, eclipses of the sun etc., were to be registered in the year in which they occurred. Thus, the rain of fish must have been recorded by P. as a curious natural phenomenon under the year of a given *Prytanis* at Eresos. Cato, who knew the early Roman *annales* as well as some early Greek chronicles, considered *Paradoxa* and curious natural phenomena to be a charac-

---

91 It is well-known from epigraphical sources that one of the *Prytaneis* was also the eponymous magistrate in Eresos; cf. *IG* XII^2, 529,12 and other examples in Labarre (1996: 178-182) taken from the Addenda to *IG* XII by Hiller von Gärtringen (1939) and Charitonidis (1968).

92 Charon *FGrHist* 262 T 1. This work is described by the *Suda* as a χρονικὰ-work. It was presumably inspired by Hellanikos' *Priestesses of Hera* in Argos (see *FGrHist* 4 F 74-84). But the title of Charon's work is perhaps corrupt, since the Spartans did not have *Prytaneis* as officials. Hence Westermann suggested emending the title to e.g. Πρυτάνεις Λαμψακενῶν.

93 Demetrios of Phaleron F 149-154 Wehrli IV = *FGrHist* 228 F 1-3 (10; 44).

94 Cf. Mosshammer (1977: 105-132) and Mosshammer (1979: 98-99).

95 The same holds true for local histories of different cities.

teristic feature of some Roman *annales*, which indicated their narrow scope of interest and separated them from genuine historical works[97]. Indeed, the story in F 7 about the miraculous rain of fish which lasted for three days at Chersonnesos has nothing to do with Lesbian local history or disputed matters of chronology, but reminds one of a collection of *Paradoxa*. We know of Peripatetic examples of this genre beginning already in P.'s generation with Ps.-Aristotle's *Mirabiles auscultationes*. Eusthatios in his commentary understood F 7 to be an example of such *Paradoxa*[98]. Hence Wehrli thought that F 7 might have come from a paradoxographical work, were it not for the explicit reference to *The Prytaneis of Eresos*[99]. P.'s chronicle became a model for Myrsilos of Methymna's *Lesbiaka*, an early Hellenistic Lesbian local history which also contained some marvels. It may be remarked that Myrsilos was also the author of a work entitled *Historical Curiosities*.

(8) According to P. the Mytilenaean Leon, whose ancestry was Athenian, was never beaten at draughts. The fragment has been assigned to this work for no other reason than that it would be a fitting remark in a local history or a chronicle of Eresos to remind the readers of their famous fellow-citizen Leon. The origins of the πεττεία and the names of some famous players have been of interest to historians of culture from the time of Herodotos[100]. If the fragment is to be assigned to *The Prytaneis of Eresos*, then this work probably included other prosopographical remarks on famous inhabitants of Lesbos or a digression on the moral aspects of playing draughts.

(9) I follow Mosshammer's proposal[101] and assign F 9 and F 10 to *The Prytaneis of Eresos*. Admittedly, this attribution lacks certainty, be-

---

96 For the context of the passage in Eustathios, which was not taken directly from P., but from Athenaios, see the edition of van der Valk I (1971) with an extensive introduction on Eustathios and his sources.

97 Cf. Cato F 77 Peter = Gell. 2,28,6 (I am indebted to G. Schepens for this reference).

98 Eusth. *Comm. Hom.* on *Ilias* A v. 39 on θαυμάσια. F 7 is to be found in the context of other similar ancient and contemporary Byzantine (van der Valk 1971: 57, 20-25) miraculous stories, such as a heavy rain of frogs, see van der Valk (1971: 57, 28-36); for characteristic themes in Hellenistic paradoxographers see Jackson (1995) and Schepens – Delcroix (1996: esp. 375-409); for an interesting 20th-century collection of similar marvels see Fort (1995).

99 Two similar fragments (F 34-35 Wehrli IX) were tentatively assigned by Wehrli in his commentary to a paradoxographical work by P. with no known title.

100 Cf. Herodot. 1,94.

101 Cf. Mosshammer (1979: 233).

cause no explicit title is to be found in the fragments, but their contents provide justification. Both fragments derive from the *Miscellanies* (Στρωματεῖς) of Clemens of Alexandria[102]. Clemens was one of the earliest Christian scholars and head of the Alexandrian school of Christian scholars in the second century A.D. It may not be pure chance that fragments from P. have been preserved by both Clemens and Athenaios (cf. F 7), two ancient writers who lived at the end of the 2nd century A.D. and had the opportunity to use the rich collections in the libraries of Alexandria, where they were possibly able to find a copy of such rare chronicles as *The Prytaneis of Eresos*. While modern scholars readily accept the breadth of Clemens' reading, it is, however, generally assumed that he also drew heavily on anthologies, collections of excerpts and other derivative works[103].

Both fragments deal with questions of chronology. F 9 deals with some disputed dates in Greek history from the fall of Troy to Alexander's crossing to Asia. F 10 discusses the chronological relationship between four early Greek poets, Terpandros, Lesches, Archilochos and Arktinos. In F 9 we find a discussion of the time that had elapsed between the return of the descendants of Herakles (or the capture of Troy) and the beginning of Alexander's Persian war (i.e. his crossing into Asia in early 334 B.C.). This event was a key date in Greek chronology and a point of departure for a relative chronological scheme in P.'s lifetime and for calculations by later chronographers and historians. P. may have discussed this important date in works belonging to various literary genres, but the extensive chronological calculation perhaps fits best into a historical work or a chronicle. Clemens of Alexandria, at least, compares P.'s opinion with those of other historians and chronographers. In *The Prytaneis of Eresos* P. proposed a chronological scheme for important dates in earlier Greek history, which differed from that used by Ephoros in his *Histories*[104]. The capture of Troy was the natural starting-point for all calculations. From that year to the return of the Sons of Herakles some writers counted 120, others 180 years. Unfortunately we are not told by Clemens to which group of authors P. belonged. Thus it is impossible to determine in which year Troy was captured according to P.

---

[102] Ed. STÄHLIN (1960); for an interpretation, see OVERBECK – BERNOUILLI – FRÜCHTEL (1936); on Clemens' philosophical and theological ideas, see LILLA (1971).
[103] See, e.g., CHADWICK (1985: 34-37) and FERGUSON (1974: 17-20).
[104] Cf. MOSSHAMMER (1977) and (1979: 226-233).

Differing opinions in regard to some early dates in Greek history are found already among the first writers who tried to establish a consistent chronology. From the return of the Sons of Herakles to the beginning of Alexander's Persian campaign P. counted 715 years, Ephoros 735[105]. If we assume that the work from which the fragment of P. is derived, was written after the publication of the *Histories* of Ephoros, F 9 may point to an extensive treatment of early Greek chronology and history by P. in *The Prytaneis of Eresos* and to his dispute over key dates in early Greek history with contemporary authoritative historians such as Ephoros. At any rate, Clemens of Alexandria regards P. as a scholarly writer on early Greek history and chronology who deserves to be confronted with authoritative historians and chronographers such as Ephoros, Timaios, Kleitarchos, Eratosthenes and Duris.

(10) Further speculation about the character of P.'s *The Prytaneis of Eresos* is possible if we accept the proposal by Mosshammer[106] that F 10 on the chronology of Terpander, Archilochos, Lesches and Arktinos should be assigned to this local chronicle. Wehrli already allowed for the possibility that this fragment might be better grouped with F 7-9 than with F 13, the only fragment definitely from P.'s *On Poets*.

Mosshammer considered F 10 to be an important testimony on the development of Greek literary history and as evidence for chronological research between the early works of Hellanikos or Charon and the Hellenistic chronographers such as Eratosthenes or Apollodoros. Moreover, Mosshammer revived Böckh's proposal, made in his edition of *Marmor Parium* in 1843, that P. (together with Aristoxenos) could be the main source of *Marmor Parium* for all notices on early literary history. This proposal was sharply rejected by Jacoby in his edition of the *Marmor Parium* in 1904 and again in *FGrHist*[107]. *Marmor Parium* dates the ἀκμή of Terpandros and his far-reaching musical innovations relatively late, namely to the years 645/4 or 644/3 B.C.,

[105] Cf. Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 F 223; Clemens adds that Timaios and Kleitarchos both counted 820 years, cf. Timaios *FGrHist* 566 F 126 and Kleitarchos *FGrHist* 137 F 7, but Eratosthenes *FGrHist* 241 F 1d, depending on the reading in the text of Clemens, either 770 or 774 years; Duris *FGrHist* 76 F 41 counted from the capture of Troy to Alexander's crossing to Asia 1000 years, perhaps because only a perfect number of years could separate such great historical events; see Jacoby's commentaries on these fragments in *FGrHist*.

[106] Cf. Mosshammer (1979: 233).

[107] Cf. Jacoby (1904b: 63-107 = 1961: 521-559), (1904a) and his commentaries on *FGrHist* 239.

which contradicts the chronological tradition on Terpandros in Apollodoros[108]. Thus it is obviously based on a different chronological tradition, which might derive from P., who provided exact dates in his chronicle and who differed from other earlier calculations (cf. also F 9). It would have been fitting for P. to give the exact years of the ἀκμή of famous poets in the context of his local chronicle *The Prytaneis of Eresos* as well as in his treatise *On Poets*. In this collection of fragments I have decided to include the chronological discussion and to attribute it to his local chronicle.

Clemens of Alexandria thought that Hellanikos had dated Terpandros much too early. So to refute him, Clemens quoted P.'s dissenting chronology. P. proposed a recent date for the ἀκμή of Arktinos and made him a contemporary of the Lesbian Lesches. He then stated (out of local bias?) that Lesches was the winner in a poetical contest against the Milesian Arktinos, a story which may have been invented after the model of the famous *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*. Thus P. placed the early poets in the following chronological order: Archilochos, Lesches, Terpandros. Hellanikos had established an earlier chronology and had made use of the fact that the ἀκμή and victory of Terpandros at the recently instituted Carneian Games had occurred during the reign of king Midas (not Gyges), but he had not given an exact year for these events[109]. P. differed from this tradition and favoured a later date, perhaps 645/4 or 644/3 B.C., for the ἀκμή of Terpandros, although we cannot say with certainty which precise year he adopted.

The main points in P.'s chronological scheme, according to which Lesches the Lesbian was younger than Archilochos and older than Terpandros, are rejected by most modern scholars, as they follow the chronology of Apollodoros, which is based on Hellanikos and Sosibios[110]. In addition to the scanty remarks in later Greek authors, modern research has also been able to make use of some indisputable dates from cuneiform sources and astronomical calculations. In As-

---

108 Cf. Jacoby (1902) and Mosshammer (1979: 226-233).

109 Cf. *FGrHist* 4 F 85a/b from the *Catalogue of the Winners at the Carneian Games*. The exact year of this chronological scheme was fixed by Apollodoros by synchronizing Hellanikos (*FGrHist* 4 F 85a) and the remarks of Sosibios (*FGrHist* 595 F 3) on 676/5 B.C. as the first year of the first Carneian festival.

110 Cf. Nestle and Liebich (1961: 55) on Terpander and (1961: 49-50) on Archilochos; Lesky (1971: 155-156 and 178) on Terpander and (1971: 135) on Archilochos.

syrian cuneiform sources the first attack of the Cimmerians against King Midas is dated to about 679 B.C. and his death during another attack of the Cimmerians to about 652 B.C. In a famous fragment of Archilochos the eclipse of the sun on April 6th 648 B.C. is mentioned[111]. This event marks the earliest date established with certainty in the history of Greek literature and at the same time provides an approximate date for the ἀκμή of Archilochos[112]. The chronological device of counting 40 years as the usual interval between the ἀκμαί of different generations of poets and of calculating the exact dates of certain poets on the basis of this assumption, instead of providing only a relative chronology, had already been developed by Peripatetics such as P. (and e.g. ARISTOXENOS F 16 WEHRLI II) in the late fourth century B.C. Hellenistic scholars such as Apollodoros were not the first to invent this convenient method of calculation[113].

4. ON THE SOCRATICS

(11-12) Both fragments relate an anecdote about famous pupils of Sokrates, namely Antisthenes (F 11) and Aristippos (F 12), but only F 11 is referred to in Diogenes Laertios with the full title of the original work *On the Socratics*. Although it may be suggested that the two fragments should be treated *in extenso* in FGrHist IV B in the context of Hellenistic doxographical literature or in the section on the history of Greek literature, they have been included in the present collection because they also testify to P.'s biographical interest in the lives and sayings of Sokrates and his famous pupils. *On the Socratics* was probably a collection of anecdotes on or an early collective biography of the Socratics. P. was among the first (if not actually the first) to treat in a monograph the Socratics as a *group of disciples* of one philosopher in a biographical or doxographical sense[114]. But more important works on Sokrates were written by Demetrios of Phaleron[115] and Aristoxenos[116]. Among other Peripatetics who wrote important biographi-

---

111 ARCHILOCHOS F 122 WEST.

112 Cf. JACOBY (1941: 97-109, esp. 97 = 1961, I: 249-267, 249).

113 Cf. MOSSHAMMER (1977: 122) and (1979: 230).

114 Cf. MEJER (1978: 74-75).

115 DEMETRIOS Σωκράτους ἀπολογία or Σωκράτης F 91-98 WEHRLI IV = *FGrHist* 228 F 40-45.

116 ARISTOXENOS Σωκράτους βίος F 51-60 and Πλάτωνος βίος F 61-68 WEHRLI II = *FGrHist* IV A 2 1016.

cal works Hermippos of Smyrna, Ariston of Keos and Sotion of Alexandria are the most outstanding[117].

Müller assigned to *On the Socratics* two other passages which he classified as "fragments" from P.[118]. F 22 Müller on Hippys of Rhegion and on Petron is purely doxographical, but not biographical in nature. Hence this passage has not been included in the present collection. Moreover, in Plutarch's treatise there is no hint as to the work from which the passage has been taken. Wehrli thought it might be from *On the Tyrants of Sicily*. F 23 Müller should also be omitted in any dicussion of the scope and structure of *On the Socratics*. The lemma on Archytas in the Suda does not even mention P.'s name, unless one accepts the radical emendation of Bernhardy who suggested to reading φησὶ Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος instead of φανερῶς, the reading of all codices. Hence Müller's far-reaching conclusions on the scope of *On the Socratics* should be rejected, too. We can only guess whether P. actually dealt with other philosophical schools in this work. Pace Müller it is not at all probable that *On the Socratics* was part of a larger hypothetical work with a more general scope entitled *On the Philosophers*.

(11) In this fragment we hear of a radically new definition of a καλὸς κἀγαθός[119]. This definition breaks completely with the traditional aristocratic ideal of the *good and noble man* and prefigures the Cynic definition of ἀρετή as self-sufficiency, as taught by Antisthenes' most famous pupil, Diogenes of Sinope.

(12) F 12 is on Aristippos of Kyrene[120], the first Socratic to take money for his philosophical teaching. He was criticized by his teacher Sokrates, because he earned a comfortable income from his profes-

---

[117] Their contributions to Greek biography will be assessed *in extenso* in *FGrHist* IV A 3-5: cf. the forthcoming commentaries on Hermippos FGrHist IV A 3 1026, Ariston FGrHist IV A 4 1027 and Sotion FGrHist IV A 5 1042.

[118] Plut. *De def. or.* 422d = *FHG* II, p. 300 F 22 = F 12 Wehrli IX and *Suda* A 4121 *s.v.* Ἀρχύτας = *FHG* F 23.

[119] F 11 = *FHG* II, p. 299 F 20 = F 30 Wehrli IX = Antisthenes V A 172 Giannantoni. On the fragments of some of Antisthenes' works which are of interest for a collection of fragments on the roots of Greek biography, see *FGrHist* IV A 1 1004; on the general character of Antisthenes' philosophy and works, see Giannantoni IV (1990: 195-412); on the Greek concept of the *good and noble man,* see Wankel (1961) and recently Bourriot (1995).

[120] F 12 = *FHG* II, p. 299 F 21= F 31 Wehrli IX = Aristippos IV A 1 Giannantoni. On Aristippos' life and works, see Giannantoni IV (1990: 135-184). For further testimonies to the fact that Aristippos accepted large sums of money for his teaching, cf. Aristippos IV A 1-14 Giannantoni.

sional philosophical teaching. In the fragment under discussion we are informed by P. that Sokrates refused to compromise himself by accepting a large sum of money (20 minai or 2000 drachmai) as a gift from Aristippos. Probably P. was also trying to discredit Aristippos by telling this story.

5. ON POETS

(13) P. and Aristotle wrote works with the same title *On Poets*[121]. Aristotle's work was composed as a dialogue. Perhaps there was a similarity between the two works in scope and in formal structure. F 13 is taken from the second book of P.'s *On Poets*, but there is no hint in the ancient testimonies as to the number of books in the complete treatise. Given our insufficient knowledge of both works we cannot prove Wehrli's suggestion that *On the Socratics* and *On Poets* were each arranged by P. as a collection of monographs on individual poets or on early disciples of Sokrates[122].

Musical innovations and their εὑρεταί were a popular field of research among Peripatetic scholars. Thus it comes as no great surprise that P. was interested in the life and work of Stratonikos, a famous Athenian musician[123]. Stratonikos was also a well-known composer and propagator of a "new" musical genre[124]. A strong interest in Stratonikos' person as an innovator, modern composer, teacher and writer of treatises on music fits into the assumed biographical scope of P.'s *On Poets*. The famous κιθαριστής lived from about 410 to 360 B.C. Thus he was only a generation older than P. himself. Most of our testimonies on Stratonikos come, like F 13, from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*. P. credits Stratonikos with the invention of πολυχορδία as a new modal range in playing the kithara[125]. He was also a reputed

---

[121] Cf. Aristotle's *On Poets* F 70-77 Rose.

[122] Wehrli (1983: 554): "Sammlung von Monographien".

[123] And an inventor of jokes about his colleagues and about dumb audiences in some Greek towns, which were published only after his death as a collection under the title Εὐτράπελοι λόγοι.

[124] Cf. Maas (1931: 326-327).

[125] On πολυχορδία in Greek music and Stratonikos see Comotti (1989: 64-65 and 70) and West (1992: 367-368); Gevaert I-II (1875) is still a useful work; for a short introduction to the history of Greek music and to some philosophers' opinions on music see Neubecker (1977); the most important ancient texts on the early history of Greek music and on the history of Greek literature have been discussed in the Habilitationsschrift of Krummen (1995).

teacher of music in Athens[126] and, as appears from the fragments, perhaps wrote a treatise on musical problems[127]. P., being a Peripatetic, did not share Plato's critical attitude to musical inventions. Wehrli[128] has collected other ancient sources for philosophers' opposition to modern and complex harmonies in Greek music. The fragment under discussion does not criticize Stratonikos and his musical inventions, as P. did in *Against the Sophists* with some poems and songs written by Telenikos and Argas[129].

6. FRAGMENTS TAKEN FROM OTHER HISTORICAL OR BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

(14-23) We do not know which of P.'s works F 14-23 derive from. Hence they have been brought together in this sample under the heading *Fragments taken from other historical or biographical works*. Wehrli discussed them under *Historisches verschiedener Herkunft* (F 20-29 Wehrli IX) and *Solon und Themistokles* (F 20-28 Wehrli IX). F 14-16 concentrate on Solon and his legislation. They are taken from Plutarch's *Life of Solon* and the late lexicographical tradition, namely the *Suda* and the *Etymologicum Gudianum*. F 17-22 derive from Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles* (with the exception of F 21 from Athenaios). F 23 is taken from the lexicographical tradition and has been preserved without any reference to Solon or Themistokles. Thus most of the material in this section is found in Plutarch. Recent surveys on his sources for the *Life of Solon* and the *Life of Themistokles* stress that he relied for the historical facts and the context of his Greek lives in the 6th and 5th centuries on his own reading of the original works of the famous historians of this period, namely Thukydides, Herodotos and Ephoros; other contemporary or later sources, such as P., he used to supplement these main sources[130]. It is not possible to assign any of F 14-23 *with certainty* to a single work (or to several works) identifiable as biographical in nature and scope, but their content is of major interest for a collection of fragments on Greek biography. F 14-23 have been included because

---

[126] On Stratonikos cf. Athen. 163f and 348d.

[127] This assumption rests on the interpretation of P.'s F 13 and of the *terminus technicus* διάγραμμα, which means a musical scale or a treatise on musical modal ranges and schemes.

[128] Cf. Wehrli's commentary (1969c: 38) on F 6 with references to Plato, to Klearchos F 18 Wehrli III (1969a) and to ps.-Plutarch's treatise *De musica* 1141c.

[129] Cf. Phainias F 10 Wehrli IX.

[130] Current scholarly views on Plutarch's handling of his sources may be found in Podlecki – Duane (1992: 4053-4127, esp. on Solon 4115-4119 and on Themistokles 4120-4122); see also Stadter (1992).

they are important precursors of later fully-fledged biographies. Given what we know of the literature of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the hypothesis that the fragments derive from formal biographies does not immediately suggest itself, but we cannot rule out the possibility that they do[131]. However, since biography as a separate genre had not yet emerged (or was just about to emerge) in P.'s time, it nonetheless seems preferable to presume that F 14-23 come from one and the same or several historical works with strong biographical interests.

Cooper has recently suggested that P.'s fragments on Solon and Themistokles may have been taken from a work in which history was constructed in the form of a διαδοχή. According to Cooper "this conception of history in terms of a διαδοχή was adopted by Phaenias in a number of his works on political and philosophical history"[132]. He tentatively proposed assigning F 14-22 to one of P.'s attested works, namely *Against the Sophists*. But there is only one fragment of *Against the Sophists* that has been preserved together with the book title (F 10 Wehrli IX). It attacks two fourth-century musicians and composers, Telenikos and Argas, for sophistry. According to Cooper P. may have regarded Themistokles as a sophist, too. If so, P.'s contribution to the Peripatetic debate on the meaning of wisdom, wise men and sophists "was to mark out the stages of transition from the practical wisdom of Solon to the sophistry of Themistokles and later sophists. A key figure in the transition was Mnesiphilos, who as the student of Solon and the teacher of Themistokles marked the beginning of the transition from true πολιτικοί to mere σοφισταί"[133]. Whereas P. most probably was familiar with the concept of organizing his material as a διαδοχή and used it once in *On the Socratics*, the contents of F 14-22 in my view do not support Cooper's far-reaching conclusions on P.'s works and on the early history of the διαδοχαί.

(14) This fragment relates the story that Solon[134] was given the position of archon, mediator and Athenian legislator by the φρονιμώτατοι

---

[131] Cf. Leo (1901: 113) on P. "der von Solon und Themistokles ausführlich biographisch gehandelt hatte, sei es in einem Buch über attische Geschichte sei es in Schriften περὶ Σόλωνος und περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους."
[132] Cooper (1995: 329).
[133] Cooper (1995: 334).
[134] On Solon as the mediator in a social crisis and as an Athenian law-giver (with the Greek texts of the relevant fragments) cf. Ruschenbusch (1966) and (1994: 351-380); Manfredini – Piccirilli on Plut. *Sol.* 14,2 (1977: 178-179); on Solon's importance in Athenian history see the—on some points controversial—articles by Manville (1990: 124-156) and Rihll (1991: 101-127).

of the Athenians, i.e. by his fellow-aristocrats. According to P., Solon deceived both hostile groups of Athenian citizens, both the rich and the poor, before he was elected. In secret conversations he promised each of the parties that he would fulfil their special wishes, which in fact contradicted one another. He promised the poor the abolition of debts, land reform and a new distribution of landed property, whilst he guaranteed the rich their property rights and the maintenance of existing debts. Thus he received the support of all citizens required to carry out his legislation and reform debts. P. makes it clear at once that Solon was an honourable man, even though he played foul tricks on both parties, since he used this "noble lie" (the ἀπάτη) only ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῆς πόλεως. Solon, the wise man, legislator and, according to some 4th-century orators and historians, even the founder of "genuine" Athenian democracy, was an ideal subject for a Peripatetic philosopher like P. who was interested in Athenian history. But modern scholars have expressed doubt about the historical truth of P.'s story in F 14 and of the following two stories in chapter 14 of Plutarch's *Life of Solon*.

The first story is told to exculpate Solon from later accusations that he had attained his aims only by cheating his fellow-citizens. The interest of the state justifies a ruler using bad means to accomplish noble ends. This is a utilitarian position and a well-known principle of "Realpolitik", but would be astonishing of a Peripatetic philosopher such as P. to defend it. Mühl explained the historical context in which the story might have been invented[135]. In the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the Athenian archons declared solemnly, when they took up office, that they guaranteed full protection for each man's property during their term of office and thus preservation of the legal and social order[136]. The contemporary oath taken by the judges certainly included a passage prohibiting the abolition of debts and any new division of landed property in Attica[137]. Perhaps P. himself invented the story in F 14, because he wanted to solve the apparent contradiction between the common tradition about Solon's σεισαχθεία, on the one hand, and the oath taken by the judges and the declaration by the Athenian archons during his own lifetime which prohibited such measures, on the other.

---

135 Mühl (1955: 349-354).

136 Cf. Aristot. *Resp. Ath.* 56,2-3 with commentaries by Rhodes (1981: 622) and Chambers (1990: 389).

137 Cf. Dem. 24,149-151 for a fourth-century version of this oath taken by the judges.

Thiel made the interesting suggestion that the other two stories about Solon in chapter 14 of Plutarch's *Life of Solon*[138] may derive from P. too[139]. But P. is mentioned only for 14,2 as Plutarch's source. His source for 14,4 and 14,7-8 must, however, have been well acquainted with 4th-century political philosophy and the definitions of kingship, tyranny and lawful rule in the works of Plato and Aristotle[140]. The author from whom Plutarch took the two anecdotes in 14,4 and 14,7 cannot have lived earlier than the second half of the 4th century B.C., because he also displays profound knowledge of Xenophon's works. P. could have had such knowledge, but we should be cautious in following Thiel in his conclusions.

According to Plutarch (*Sol.*14,7), some friends encouraged Solon to follow the example of Pittakos[141], tyrant of Mytilene on Lesbos, P.'s native island, and make himself tyrant in Athens. The cunning answer, by which Solon rejects his friends' proposals[142], seems to be a later invention born of the political struggles of 4th-century Athenian demagogues. However, the historical fact that Solon rejected such proposals is sufficiently clear from his own poems[143]. But he did so for philosophical reasons and out of fundamental hatred of tyranny, not because of the personal risks attached to such a position which are alluded to in the alleged quotation[144].

(15) It is clear from F 14 and 15 that P.'s work on Solon not only covered the ἀκμή of his political life, that is, his year as Athenian archon (594/3 B.C.), but also later events up to his death in 560/59 B.C.[145]. The scholarly literature on the date and circumstances of Solon's death and on the beginning of Peisistratos' tyranny is extensive[146]. On these matters P. turns out to be a well-informed author,

---

138 Plut. *Sol.* 14,4 and 14,7-8.
139 Thiel (1938: 204-210).
140 Cf. Barker (1918); on Aristotle Schütrumpf (1991: 37-170).
141 Cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 3,14,5-6 1285 a 35-b 3; Diog. Laert. 1,75; Strab. *Geogr.* 13,2,3 C. 617.
142 Plut. *Sol.* 14,8: "a tyranny was a lovely place, but there was no way down from it."
143 E.g. Plut. *Sol.* 14,8-9 = Solon F 32 West.
144 There are some parallels between our passage and the discussion of tyranny in Xenophon's *Hieron* (cf. Xen. *Hier.* 7,11-8,10), to which Thiel (1946: 71-81) alerted his readers.
145 Cf. Manfredini – Piccirilli (1977: 282-283) on Plut. *Sol.* 32,3 = F 15.
146 Cf. recently Arrowsmith I-II (1988), Shapiro (1989), Littman (1990) and Manville (1990).

whom Plutarch prefers to other trustworthy sources such as Herakleides Pontikos[147]. Perhaps P. relied on the official Athenian *list of Archons*, because he supported his date by adding the names of two subsequent archons, Komias (561/60) and Hegestratos (560/59 B.C.). P., author of *The Prytaneis of Eresos*, was used to exploiting official chronological sources, but he may also have found the two dates in an Ἀτθίς, a *Local History of Athens*, e.g. that by his fellow countryman Hellanikos. Moreover, Aristotle, P.'s teacher, would have known the exact dates of Solon's death and of the beginning of Peisistratos' tyranny from his research for the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία[148], compiled by him (or in his school) about 330 B.C., and thus may have been known to P. But Aristotle does not give the names of the archons for these years. Nevertheless, he is the most likely source for P.'s dates. Plutarch is absolutely right to reject the tradition found in Herakleides Pontikos, since his considerably later date for Solon's death was invented to fit in with the anecdotes about Solon's relationship with Kroisos.

In his *Life of Solon*[149] Plutarch relates a story about Solon's alleged opposition to Peisistratos' assumption of power. It is easy to explain such a story as part of the 4th-century mystification of Solon. The inventors may have been the same orators and philosophers who claimed that Solon had established certain Athenian laws, which in fact were invented by themselves for their own political or judicial aims. Mühl observed major oppositon to Peisistratos as a tyrant and to tyranny in general in chapter 30 of the *Life of Solon*, whereas in chapter 31 Peisistratos is described in a less hostile way. There we find the entirely fictitious story that Solon and Peisistratos were reconciled before Solon died. Accordingly, Mühl suspected that Plutarch was drawing from a different source at this point in the *Life of Solon*, probably Herakleides Pontikos instead of P. But it is not possible to demonstrate that P. was the source for the entire chapter (PLUT. *Sol.* 30) and thus to recover his possible words from the text of Plutarch[150].

---

[147] HERAKLEIDES PONTIKOS F 148 WEHRLI VII.
[148] Cf. ARISTOT. *Resp. Ath.* 17,2.
[149] Cf. PLUT. *Sol.* 30-31; other well-known ancient sources for this alleged opposition are ARISTOT. *Resp. Ath.* 14 and 16; DIOD. 9,4 and 9,20 and HERODOT. 1,59-60.
[150] On P. as the source of PLUT. *Sol.* 30 see MÜHL (1956: 315-323, esp. 320-322).

(16a/b) In P.'s lifetime the ἄξονες and κύρβεις, on which Solon's laws had been displayed, had become a symbol of the whole corpus of traditional Athenian law. They were a visual reminder of Solon's legislation, and hence were often referred to by Athenian historians, orators, philosophers and learned commentators[151]. Jacoby printed F 16b as a fragment of Asklepiades of Nikaia (or Alexandria)[152], but wrote in a note that he wanted to include a fragment of P. on the κύρβεις in *FGrHist* IV, too. In his collection Wehrli included two lexicographical explanations of the *lemma* κύρβεις (F 16a from the *Suda*) or κύρβες (F 16b from the *Etymologicum Gudianum*), each as a separate fragment from P. A detailed discussion of the problems stemming from the lexicographical sources will, we hope, recommend the revised text proposed in the present commentary.

We know of four ancient commentators of the Solonian ἄξονες together with the titles of their works: Aristotle[153] (Περὶ τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξόνων in five volumes), Asklepiades[154] (Τῶν ἀξόνων ἐξηγητικά), Didymos[155] (Περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων τῶν Σόλωνος ἀντιγραφὴ πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην) and Seleukos[156] (Ὑπόμνημα τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξόνων). Unfortunately, Wehrli restricted himself in his commentary on F 16a and 16b to a short prosopographical note. He identified Asklepiades with a grammarian from Nikaia or Alexandria (second half of the third and first half of the second century B.C.)[157]. This identification has been questioned by Ruschenbusch, who suggested Asklepiades of Myrlea (first cent. B.C.)[158]. But Jacoby's and Wehrli's proposal of Asklepiades of Nikaia (or Alexandria), a disciple of Apollonios Rhodios, seems more likely[159].

---

[151] On Solon's laws and on the *Kyrbeis* and *Axones* see RUSCHENBUSCH (1966: 14-22) and, with useful additions concerning the archaeological evidence and the epigraphical testimonia, STROUD (1979). Ruschenbusch has included F 16b (= *Et. Gud.* 164,11 REITZENSTEIN) as T 2 of his collection, but excluded F 16a = *Suda* K 2745.

[152] ASKLEPIADES of Nikaia (or Alexandria) *FGrHist* 339 F 1. Unlike Wehrli, Jacoby printed the context of our lemma from which one can recognize SELEUKOS of Alexandreia *FGrHist* 341 as the common source of the definitions.

[153] RUSCHENBUSCH (1966) T 1; see *FGrHist* IIIB, p.195 and forthcoming *FGrHist* IV B.

[154] RUSCHENBUSCH (1966) T 2 und T 3 = *FGrHist* 339 T 3 und F 1.

[155] RUSCHENBUSCH (1966) T 3 = *FGrHist* 340 F 1.

[156] RUSCHENBUSCH (1966) T 4 = *FGrHist* 341 F 1-2.

[157] Cf. WEHRLI (1957: 34) on F 14a/b following WENTZEL (1896: 1631); but see also Jacoby's commentaries on ASKLEPIADES *FGrHist* 339 and on SELEUKOS *FGrHist* 341.

[158] Cf. RUSCHENBUSCH (1966: 50 n. 135).

[159] Cf. JACOBY on *FGrHist* 339 T 1 and n. 1.

Reitzenstein made some attractive proposals for editing the text of F 16. These were partly accepted by Jacoby, but not by Wehrli[160]. If one tries, however, to translate the Greek text of F 16a/b as printed by Wehrli, serious difficulties arise from its grammatical and syntactical structure. Hence some of Reitzenstein's emendations have been adopted in the present collection, too. Alpers, who is preparing an edition of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, has kindly given me his opinion[161]. If one compares the different γλῶσσαι for the word κύρβεις in the *Etymologika* and in the *Suda*, it follows that—by way of an intermediate source—the grammarian Seleukos is the common source for all Byzantine lexica on this *lemma*[162]. General considerations on the relationship between the various Byzantine lexica[163] led Alpers to conclude that Wehrli's two fragments must be brought together. Consequently I propose the following text, which has been reconstructed on the basis of the two preserved fragments F 16a/b: Κύρβεις: αἱ τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἑορτὰς ἔχουσαι· ἤτοι ἀπὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς (εἰσὶ γὰρ κυρβασίαι), ἢ κύρβεις, ἐπεὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀποκρυπτόμενα δεῖ εἶναι. Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Τῶν ἀξόνων ἐξηγητικοῖς ἀπὸ Κύρβεως τοῦ τὰς θυσίας ὁρίσαντος· ἤ, ὡς φησὶ Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος, <ἢ> ἀπὸ τοῦ ταῦτα κυρωθῆναι τοῖς γράμμασιν.

The *lemmata* on the κύρβεις bring together three etymological explanations. It is anything but clear what P.'s exact position was with regard to the correct etymology of κύρβεις and how his opinion is related to Asklepiades' later commentary. First, we find the derivation of κύρβεις from κρύπτειν, to conceal or to hide, and from the *fasti* or sacred calendars and lists with dates and ceremonies of the feasts of the gods. Plutarch reports that, according to some authors, the word κύρβεις applies strictly only to the boards on which the dates and regulations for holy rites and offerings were noted (that is the part on

---

160 Cf. *FGrHist* 339 F 1 = F 22a/b Wehrli IX = F 16a/b Engels.

161 In his letter of November 30th 1993. I gratefully acknowledge his helpful advice.

162 *FGrHist* 341 T 1-2 and F 1-2. Some additions to the definitions and etymologies in F 16a/b can be found in the so-called Ἐκλογαὶ διαφόρων λέξεων s.v. κύρβεις, in Cramer II (1835: 455,15-26). They are a source of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, see Reitzenstein (1897: 164 and n. 59); in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* we find the important note on Seleukos as its source in the genitive case ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ. Thus the asterisk * in *FGrHist* 341 F 2 is not justified; the *Eklogai* are also the source of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (which is the source of the so-called *Etymologicum Magnum* p. 547, 45) and the compilers of the Lemma on κύρβεις in the *Suda* K 2745.

163 For an excellent short introduction see Alpers (1990: 14-38); Cohn (1913: 679-730) is out of date, but has not been superseded.

religious law in the whole *corpus* of Solonian laws), and that the rest of the pillars, on which the other non-religious Solonian laws were written, were called ἄξονες[164]. From this opinion the first etymology based on the mysteries of the gods written on the κύρβεις has been derived. But Plutarch makes it clear that he himself thinks that all the boards on which the complete Solonian laws were written were called κύρβεις. Secondly, the reader of F 16a/b is prompted to think of the Solonian term κύρβεις as a synonym for the ὅροι, the boundary-stones which marked the ownership of property or indicated mortgaged land. Finally, there is an etymology whereby κύρβεις is derived from the legal *terminus technicus* κυροῦν, to make a legal claim valid in the eyes of the law. A reader of the passages in the *Suda* and in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* might assume that there was a tradition that P. had quoted the etymology of Asklepiades. But this hypothesis is extremely improbable, as we know only of two grammarians named Asklepiades (one of Myrlea and one of Nikaia) who were interested in the study of Solon's laws, and both of them lived several generations after P. The assumption that there was a third learned commentator on the ἄξονες and κύρβεις who was a contemporary of P. or even earlier than he, is displeasing. But if one follows Reitzenstein and Jacoby, the problem arising from the alleged quotation from Asklepiades disappears. Then the *lemma* quotes as P.'s opinion an etymology different from Asklepiades' later explanation: "κύρβεις· ἀπὸ τοῦ ταῦτα κυροθῆναι τοῖς γράμμασιν". This seems the most plausible solution to the problems concerning the translation and interpretation of the Greek text in F 16.

F 16 shows that P. had thoroughly studied the problems arising from Solon's legislation. Indeed, P. was a philosopher with strong historical interests, as Plutarch holds. He knew of a rare legal meaning of the word κύρβεις. Thus, it becomes even more understandable that the Alexandrian grammarian and commentator Asklepiades used one of P.'s works as a source. But the short text of F 16 gives us no help in determining from which of P.'s works the remarks on Solon in F 14-16 may have been taken. Certainly, it contained a detailed study of Solon and his legislation, but also of other events and of the chronology of his entire life. But we do not know of a special work by P. entitled *On Solon*. F 16a/b may therefore also derive from a study on Athenian constitutional history which included passages on Solon's life.

---

[164] PLUT. *Sol.* 25,1-3; cf. also ARISTOT. *Resp. Ath.* 7,1 on the κύρβεις with commentaries by RHODES (1981: 131-134) and CHAMBERS (1990: 167-169).

(17-22) F 17-22 concern the life of the Athenian statesman Themistokles. His contemporaries were already sharply divided in their view of him, and episodes from his life were often used as examples by historians, philosophers and biographers. None of these F (17-22) have come down to us with the title of the work from which they derive. Thus it is possible that they have all been taken from a single work, but they may equally be from different works by P., such as a treatise on Athenian history which included characteristic episodes from Themistokles' life, an excursus on Athenian orators and demagogues, a collection of historical examples of Aristotelian βίοι, of even a work foreshadowing later biographies of Themistokles.

In his work (or in the different works?), from which F 17-22 have been derived, P. gave very detailed information about Themistokles' life. However, to the limited extent to which we can judge, he did not attempt a serious historical analysis of Themistokles' place in Athenian history. Instead, he was primarily interested in the ambiguous character of a leading Greek statesman, which he wished to illustrate by means of suitable anecdotes and episodes from his life. Leo, who was familiar with the manifold problems concerning the roots of Greek biography, was entirely correct when he stated in regard to P. as a source of Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles* that P. had treated Themistokles in a thoroughly biographical manner[165].

P. regarded Themistokles as an ambivalent character. He acknowledged his intelligence, his military genius, his strategic and diplomatic skills during the Persian wars, as most 5th-century historians had done[166]. P. admired his rhetorical power and ready wit as well as his personal courage in seeking a place of refuge with his Persian enemies. But at the same time he emphasizes some faults of character or sinister and ambiguous aspects of Themistokles, which had already been criticized by earlier historians and political writers, such as Herodotos, Thukydides and Stesimbrotos. Hence in P.'s stories Themistokles is shown taking bribes, blackmailing his fellow Athenian citizens, bribing others e.g. Architeles and the Spartan commander Eurybiades, participating in a barbarian sacrifice of captive Persians, betraying and deserting the Greek cause to save his own life and finally seeking refuge in Persia, where he lived as a pro-Persian tyrant

---

165 Cf. Leo (1901: 110): "wenigstens Themistokles, die stärkste Persönlichkeit der älteren attischen Geschichte und schon von Thukydides bevorzugt, ist ganz biographisch behandelt".

166 Cf. den Boer (1962: 225-237 = 1979: 54-66).

ruling over several Greek cities in Asia Minor. Judged by the standards of Aristotle's ethics and the Peripatetic school Themistokles (unlike Solon) was no example for P.'s readers to imitate.

Perhaps P. was influenced by his teacher Aristotle, when he introduced a clear element of malice into the picture of Themistokles. In the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία we find an assessment of Solon and Themistokles similar to that found in P.'s fragments. Aristotle disliked Themistokles and hence made the *Areiopagos* council ultimately responsible for the victory at Salamis[167]. Thus the philosopher implicitly reduced the merits of Themistokles' brilliant strategy. Finally, Aristotle assigned the first draft of the decisive strategic plan to Aristeides instead of Themistokles.

(17) In the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C. a list of distinguished Athenian politicians with foreign mothers included Kleisthenes, Themistokles and Kimon. Plutarch and Athenaios[168] are our most important sources for early traditions on the place of origin of Themistokles' mother[169]. P. maintained she was a Carian woman named Euterpe[170], and in agreement with this tradition Neanthes calls her a woman from Halikarnassos[171]. But according to Amphikrates[172] her name was Abrotonon and she came from Thrace, and Cornelius Nepos testifies to a tradition that she was from Akarnania[173]. Probably none of these four authorities had any reliable information about her name or place of origin. Judged by Athenian standards, all the foreign towns or countries named above were not very reputable, and hence information about her may have been drawn

---

[167] Cf. ARISTOT. *Resp. Ath.* 23,1.
[168] PLUT. *Them.* 1,1-2 (= F 15) and ATHEN. 13,576 c-d.
[169] For a complete collection and a critical assessment of ancient testimonies on the lineage, parents and family-connections of Themistokles, son of Neokles from Phrearrioi, see BAUER and FROST (1967), DAVIES (1971: 211-220 with a useful stemma), PODLECKI (1975) and FROST (1980: 60-63).
[170] Cf. F 15.
[171] *FGrHist* 84 F 2b; there is good reason for accepting with Jacoby that F 2b does not come from Neanthes' biographical work Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν, but from his historical work entitled Ἑλληνικά *FGrHist* 84 F 2a, the source of our information on Euterpe, Themistokles' mother.
[172] Cf. AMPHIKRATES Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν ap. ATHEN. 13,576c-d = *FHG* IV, p. 300 F 1 = *FGrHist* IV A 6. Because this treatise included pieces of information on the life of Themistokles, a famous statesman, it was not limited to biographies of philosophers or writers as examples of *illustrious men*.
[173] NEP. *Them.* 1,2.

from jokes in contemporary comedy about her[174]. Neanthes of Kyzikos used P. as his main source for Themistokles. He defended P.'s version against other opinions and wanted to supplement P.'s remarks by providing an additional detail, namely the name of the city of Halikarnassos.

A striking parallel to Plutarch's lack of information on Themistokles' parents and childhood is the fact that he was not even able to give the names of the mothers of such famous Athenian generals and politicians as Nikias, Demosthenes, Lamachos, Phormion, Thrasybulos and Theramenes[175]. Thus perhaps Plutarch did not know of any fully-fledged biographies of Themistokles or the other prominent Athenians mentioned, whereas he was able to discuss the lineage of Alkibiades, whose life had been treated in early biographies because of his connection with Sokrates and his fascinating personality.

(18) Plutarch's description of the political and military situation during the fighting around Cape Artemision follows Herodotos' narrative. He acknowledges Themistokles' brilliant military strategy and his diplomatic skills, but also points to some darker sides of his character when he relates two stories taken from Herodotos and P. about Themistokles' bribery of Eurybiades and Architeles. P. probably invented the second story about Themistokles and Architeles as an elaboration (or as a double) of the well-known story in Herodotos about Eurybiades and Themistokles[176]. In this story Themistokles cleverly used the money he himself had received from the Euboeans to bribe Eurybiades and to influence him and the council of the Greek allies to the advantage of the Euboeans. According to modern scholarly opinion Herodotos wished by means of this invented story to explain to his readers why the Greeks did not withdraw their ships. There were, however, sound strategic reasons for the decision of Eurybiades and the Greek πρόβουλοι to fight the battle of Artemision, and it is unneccessary to assume with Herodotos and P. that bribery was the driving force behind the battle[177].

---

174 See Davies (1971: 213-214).

175 Cf. Plut. *Alc.* 1,3; on Plutarch's childhood narratives and the general importance of such stories for Greek biography, see Pelling (1990: 213-244).

176 Cf. Herodot. 8,5.

177 For the roles of Eurybiades and Themistokles in political decisions from the battle at Cape Artemision to the battle of Salamis, see Hörhager (1973: 43-59); Hammond (1988: 518-591 esp. 552) dismisses the Herodotean story as an invention.

Whereas both stories related by P. lay stress on Themistokles' cleverness and his unscrupulous bribery and cheating, in the stories told by Herodotos Themistokles acts in a more honourable way. In P.'s account he deliberately plays an unpleasant trick upon Architeles, the captain of the Athenian state trireme. First he incited the crew against their captain, whom he knew had no more money to pay their wages. Then after he had placed Architeles in an embarassing and dishonourable situation, he cheated him by sending him the box with the dinner of bread and meat, under which a large sum of money was hidden as a bribe. To put it frankly, P. makes Themistokles act like a blackmailer to confound Architeles' intention to sail home with his crew in a situation of political and military crisis[178]. Obviously, P. has brought an element of malice into his picture of Themistokles.

In P.'s days the crew of the Athenian state galleys received fixed state-pay, namely four *obols* a day[179]. However, Architeles' dire financial straits in P.'s story presuppose that in 480 B.C. public pay for the crews did not yet exist. Hence P., who would normally have known of the state-pay, is possibly using an older version of the story of the bribery of Architeles. If we knew the exact year of the introduction of wages paid by the Athenian state, we could make a guess as to who ultimately invented the story which P. told in a more elaborate version.

F 18 and 19 are good examples of P.'s ability to compose thrilling stories. We do not know enough of the context in which these stories were told, but probably they were intended to illustrate key features of Themistokles' character. Some similar passages in Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles* have been claimed by Bodin and Laqueur[180] as further "fragments" of P., but their arguments are not convincing, although it may very well be true that Plutarch used a work of P. for some further details of his *Life of Themistokles* without acknowledging his source.

---

178 FROST (1980: 106-108) explained P.'s story by suggesting that the Eresian may have mixed up two different stories about the Athenian Architeles and the Corinthian Adeimantos.

179 See HARP. s.v. Πάραλος Π 20 KEANEY and Jacoby's commentaries on PHILOCHOROS *FGrHist* 328 F 47-48 (III b, p. 234-235); see also JORDAN (1975: 157-158), who gives no exact year for the introduction of state pay during the 5th century, and recently GABRIELSEN (1994: 110-114).

180 Cf. BODIN I (1915: 251-281) and II (1917: 117-157); LAQUEUR (1938: 1588).

Since it cannot be demonstrated that the passages in question[181] come from P., they cannot be used as evidence to claim the existence of, and to reconstruct the contents and the scope of a possible political biography of Themistokles by P.

(19) The passage on Themistokles and the human sacrifice or ritual killing of three noble Persians before the battle of Salamis is perhaps the most thrilling scene in P.'s preserved historical and biographical fragments[182]. He intentionally uses many verb forms. Thus the action is driven forward by the wording and the grammatical structure of the language. He embellishes his prose with glamorous rhetorical figures. He alludes to the normal procedure of making a sacrifice before battle and makes use of religious terminology and omens very effectively to convey the impression of ἐνάργεια, especially the sneeze from the right (lucky) side and the sudden blaze which flared up from the fire of the sacrifice at the same time. The fragment describes a

---

[181] Cf. WEHRLI (1969a: 35) on Bodin's and Laqueur's studies: a biography on Themistokles "ist aber die unerwiesene Voraussetzung für die Quellenforschungen von L. Bodin ... und Laqueur, welche darum auch zu wenig überzeugenden Ergebnissen geführt haben"; see also WEHRLI (1983: 554); in spite of methodological reservations I include a list of the passages, which following Bodin and Laqueur could derive from an alleged *Life of Themistokles* by P.: F 17 = PLUT. *Them.* 1,1-2; PLUT. *Them.* 2,8 (like *Them.* 10,3 and 19,3-6, two passages hostile to Themistokles and showing him to be a fierce demagogue); PLUT. *Them.* 3,1-5 (on his ambitious character); PLUT. *Them.* 5,3-5 and 7 (criticizing his unrestrained ambition); F 18 = PLUT. *Them.* 7,6-7; PLUT. *Them.* 10,1-3 (demagogical use of oracles and omens); PLUT. *Them.* 11,1 (on Aristeides' banishment); PLUT. *Them.* 11,3-6 (famous sayings attributed to Themistokles): PLUT. *Them.* 12,6-8 (an alleged dialogue between Themistokles and Aristeides before the battle of Salamis; perhaps the first strategem); F 19 = PLUT. *Them.* 13,2-5; PLUT. *Them.* 14,3-4 (a hostile reworking of earlier material taken from Herodotos and a Περσικά-source); PLUT. *Them.* 16,2-4 (a dialogue between Themistokles and Aristeides, before the messenger was sent to persuade Xerxes to order a fast retreat); *Them.* 17,19, and 21 (P. as an intermediate source between Herodotos and Plutarch?); PLUT. *Them.* 23-25 (Themistokles' flight from Athens; Bodin and Laqueur assign all passages to P. in which Plutarch agrees with the account of THUK. 1,135-138); F 20 = PLUT. *Them.* 27,6; PLUT. *Them.* 27,7-8 and 28,1-4 (P. based on THUK. 1,137,4); PLUT. *Them.* 28,6 (the *chiliarch's* prayer to Ahriman); PLUT. *Them.* 29,2 (a remark by the *chiliarch* Rhoxanes); PLUT. *Them.* 29,3 (the salutation scene and the second *proskynesis*); PLUT. *Them.* 29,5 (Themistokles asks for one year in which to learn Persian; this story is based on THUK. 1,137,4 and 1,138,1); PLUT. *Them.* 29,6-10 (cf. THUK. 1,138,2); F 22 = PLUT. *Them.* 29,11; PLUT. *Them.* 31,1-2 (Themistokles' insolent behaviour at Sardeis; his flight to the satrap's harem where he even bribes the concubines); PLUT. *Them.* 31,4-7 (envy of Kimon's success as the dishonourable motive for Themistokles' suicide).

[182] Cf. Wehrli's valuable commentary on F 19 and BODINS over-subtle interpretations (1917: 118-123); see also PLUT. *Arist.* 9,1-3; PLUT. *Pelop.* 21,3 and DIOD. 11,57,1-5.

battlefield sacrifice which was familiar to all Greek soldiers. During the performance of these sacrifices both the priest (μάντις) *and* the general in command, Themistokles, had to fulfil certain functions[183]. Thus Themistokles was not just a passive observer of that cruel sacrifice. He had to take part in the consecration and preparation of the Trojan victims of the sacrifice by cutting their fore-locks. This interesting detail, however, was not related by P. as far as we can conclude from the fragment under discussion.

P. makes a remarkable rhetorical and stylistic effort to give a historically untrustworthy scene the impression of authenticity. He presents Themistokles as a military and political leader who at the moment of crisis gives way to the brutal and irrational emotions of the masses. Although Themistokles disdained the barbarian practice of human sacrifice from the start and is set apart from the reaction of the people in P.'s narrative, he is unable to prevent such a cruel ritual. But the driving force behind this barbarian act is clearly the priest and seer Euphrantides, who exploits the irrational emotions of the soldiers.

Our best sources for the battle of Salamis are the messenger's report in Aischylos' Πέρσαι[184] and Herodotos' description of the battle in his Ἱστορίαι[185]. Aischylos and Herodotos agree upon the important fact that the three noble Persians were captured *during* the battle on the island of Psyttaleia and that only then were they killed. But according to P. Aristeides captured the three noble Persian youths, the sons of the king's sister Sandauke, *before* the battle started[186]. P. must have known the reports on the battle in Aischylos and Herodotos, but once more deliberately chose to give a different and a more elaborate story, perhaps taking his version from Ktesias' Περσικά[187].

---

[183] On Greek battlefield sacrifices to enforce victory, see PRITCHETT III (1979: 48 with n. 4 and 83-90, esp. 85); PRITCHETT (1979: 126-127) has also some useful parallels of sneezes from the right side as lucky omens.

[184] AISCHYL. *Pers.* 447-471; see also LAZENBY (1988: 168-185).

[185] HERODOT. 8,95; for the historical events cf. BURN (1962: 450-475) and more recently HAMMOND (1988: 569-591); for an evaluation of the two best sources, namely Herodotos and Aischylos, see ROUX (1974: 51-94).

[186] Cf. PLUT. *Arist.* 9,2-4; our passage from PLUT. *Them.* 13,2-5 and PLUT. *Pelop.* 21,3; see also Wehrli's commentary on F 17.

[187] But as BURN neatly observed (1962: 475): "The Quellenkritik of an author, himself lost, is a task from which angels might shrink"; on Ktesias see KÖNIG (1972), BIGWOOD (1978: 19-41) and AUBERGER (1991: 1-12).

The majority of commentators[188] think that P.'s story of the sacrifice before the battle of Salamis should be rejected for several reasons. It contradicts the explicit reports in Aischylos and Herodotos (and even some aspects of the same story in Plutarch's *Life of Aristides*). Historians of Greek religion, especially Henrichs[189], have raised serious objections to the historicity of a human sacrifice in the context of an Athenian battlefield sacrifice in the 5th century. They surmise that it was the Lesbian historian and philosopher P. himself who invented the story. Their strongest argument is the curious fact that Euphrantides explicitly requests permission to offer the sacrifice to Dionysos Omestes[190]. Now the most reliable sources know of Athenian sacrifices before the battle of Salamis to Artemis, Aias and Zeus Tropaios. Each of these three sacrifices is completely in accordance with Athenian religious traditions[191]. Dionysos Omestes, "the eater of raw flesh", however, did not belong to the 5th-century Athenian pantheon, but was revered on Lesbos, P.'s native island. This is made sufficiently clear by Alkaios[192]. Haslam has published a papyrus fragment from a work which dealt with early Lesbian history and myths[193]. Col. 2 of the papyrus gives different αἰτίαι for the cult name Διόνυσος Ὠμηστής. In col. 2,18-27 the name Ὠμηστής is explained with reference to a special sacrifice to Dionysos (col. 2,19 and 2,24). Because the relevant lines have only been preserved in fragmentary condition, their exact meaning is not clear. It seems that Omestes is not identical with Dionysos, but could be either the priest who performed the sacrifice, or even (but less probably) a name for the human victim[194]. The cult of Dionysos Omestes is also attested on Chios and Tenedos. But it is entirely improbable that the Athenians introduced a cruel new sacrifice to a new deity from Lesbos before the battle of Salamis.

Notwithstanding its improbable historicity the story in F 19 has often been adduced in discussions of human sacrifices and similar ceremonies of ritual killing in Greece during the archaic and classical periods

---

188 Cf. e.g. Frost (1980: 150).
189 Henrichs (1980: 195-235; esp. 208-224; see also some interesting remarks in the discussion p. 236-242) and Hughes (1991: 112-115); Bonnechère (1994: 181-225 and esp. 288-291), however, does not rule out the possibility that Athenian prisoners may actually have been sacrificed as a φάρμακον σωτηρίας.
190 See Henrichs (1980: 218-224).
191 See, most recently, Hughes (1991: 113 n. 129) following Henrichs and Pritchett.
192 Alk. F 129 Lobel – Page.
193 Haslam (1986: 112-125) = P.Oxy. 3711. There is no clear hint as to the author of the text in the papyrus.
194 Cf. Henrichs (1980: 218-224) and Haslam (1986: 122-123).

and has been used especially as evidence of human sacrifices in 5th-century Athens[195]. There are some well-known stories of human sacrifices or ritual killings in Greek myths. Some of them were transformed in famous works of literature by Athenian poets, for instance by Euripides in his tragedies *Iphigenia on Tauris* and *Iphigenia in Aulis*. But the intended sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis before the war against Troy is no decisive parallel for the alleged "historical" human sacrifice before the battle of Salamis, since at Aulis the goddess Artemis substituted an animal for Iphigenia. It was this animal which was actually killed and from which the priests tried to foretell the future. The most influential epic model for a ritual killing or a "Totenopfer" was that of the twelve Trojan captives who were sacrificed in honour of the dead Patroklos by Achilleus. There are some trustworthy archaeological testimonies to similar human sacrifices in certain Greek states during geometric and archaic times. The victims of a ritual killing have been found in the excavations of the Heroon of Lefkandi in Euboia (10th century B.C.), at Salamis on Cyprus or at Anemospilia on Crete (late 8th century B.C.). In both cases the archaeological evidence shows striking similarities to Homer's description of a sacrifice for the dead hero during his funeral ceremony[196]. Plutarch tells a story in his *Life of Philopoimen* that in 183 B.C. the Achaeans stoned to death some Messenian captives as a "Totenopfer"[197] in honour of the dead Achaean statesman.

But only very few testimonies of human sacrifice or cases of the ritual killing of humans *before* decisive battles are recorded in the Greek world in classical and Hellenistic times. From Plutarch's *Life of Pelopidas*[198] comes a story that a human sacrifice was intended, but not performed, before the battle at Leuktra. Skedasos, the father of two girls who had been mistreated by the Lacedaemonians, appeared to Epaminondas and claimed the sacrifice of a girl. But instead of a human victim an animal was sacrificed. If P. knew this story, it might

---

[195] There is extensive literature on the subject, see SCHWENN (1915), BURKERT (1979), (1983) and (1994), HUGHES (1991: 71-138) and BONNECHÈRE (1994) and (1997); RIVES (1995: 65-85) is primarily concerned with Christian propaganda against pagan traditions of human sacrifices.

[196] Cf. HOM. *Il.* (18,336-337; 21,26-28; 23,22-23 and 174-76). Two Euripidean tragedies (*Troades* and *Hecuba*) treated the sacrifice of Polyxeina after the capture of Troy (EUR. *Tr.* 622-23; *Hec.* 40-41, 107-228). For the evidence from the excavations at Lefkandi, Salamis and Anemospilia see BLOME (1984: 19) and (1991: 45-60).

[197] PLUT. *Phil.* 21,9; cf. SCHWENN (1915: 65).

[198] PLUT. *Pelop.* 21,3-22,4.

have been the model for his invention of the Athenian human sacrifice before the battle of Salamis. Human sacrifices and recorded cases of the ritual killing of humans in the context of a battlefield sacrifice (as in the fragment under discussion) need to be distinguished from cruel civic rituals of purification, especially the ritual of the φαρμακός, the violent expulsion of a human scapegoat[199]. Thus, the Athenian scapegoat-ritual at the Θαργελία cannot be adduced as proof of the historicity of P.'s story of a human sacrifice before the battle of Salamis.

There is another obscure story, namely that of the Locrian Maidens[200], which could perhaps point to another case of human sacrifice in Greece. Finally, Porphyrios in a short notice hints at the feast of the Χρόνια in Rhodes[201], during which a convicted criminal was killed in a strictly regulated ceremony. Some significant details, such as the procession, the cult-image of the god, the decoration of the human victim and the characteristic detail of giving him, like an animal, a drink before killing him seem to imply that this ritual was indeed a human sacrifice in the strict sense[202]. There are only a few other examples from classical and Hellenistic times of the killing of prisoners of war[203], and of the self-sacrifice of citizens in the Greek world, which may actually have been enforced by officials or fellow-citizens in these states. For human sacrifice as a regular cult practice was by the common consent of all Greeks regarded as an act of extreme cruelty and as an abominable barbarian rite. Herodotos and later historians dwelt upon bloody stories of human sacrifice among the Scythians[204] and other tribes on the fringes of Mediterranean civilisation such as the Celts, Caucasians and Thracians.

(20) Plutarch knew of various versions of Themistokles' famous flight into exile in Persia. He refers to the narratives of the historians Thukydides, Charon of Lampsakos, Ephoros, Deinon, Kleitarchos and Herakleides and discusses their chronological schemes. In addi-

---

199 Cf. Bremmer (1983: 299-320; esp. 300-303) and recently Hughes (1991: 164-165); for the theory of sacrifice as a driving force in culture and for an anthropological and theological interpretation of *scapegoat rituals* see also Girard (1986), (1987a) and (1987b).

200 See Hughes (1991: 166-184) on the *Locrian Maidens*.

201 Cf. Porphyr. *Abst.* 2,54,1-3.

202 Burkert (1994: 99) regards this story as evidence for a human sacrifice, or at least for religious terror before a ritual killing; but see Hughes (1991: 125).

203 Ducrey (1968: 31; 36 n. 2 and 204-206).

204 Herodot. 4,62.

tion, he quotes P. at length, but unfortunately without giving the title of P.'s work. Finally he reminds his readers of an additional detail in the story as related by P., which derives from Eratosthenes' treatise Περὶ πλούτου[205]. To judge from the contents of F 20, the story may be from a historical work, a collection of anecdotes and episodes about famous people or even from a biographical work. It seems that Plutarch did not find any precise indication of the time (during the reign of Xerxes or of Artaxerxes) of the reported dialogue in P., because P. is not named as one of the many authorities among the historians whom Plutarch quotes on the disputed chronology. This may perhaps be an indication that Plutarch's source was a collection of anecdotes or a biographical work. Following Thukydides and the other historians for the main historical facts Plutarch used P.'s lively[206] episode to embellish and elaborate their more sober narratives. Plutarch regarded P.'s story as trustworthy. At least he makes no dissenting comment, as he does for instance in regard to some unreliable details he takes from Stesimbrotos' *On Themistokles, Thukydides and Perikles*[207]. It is remarkable that Stesimbrotos is not named in this passage as a source for Themistokles' exile, although Plutarch had quoted Stesimbrotos on the early phases of Themistokles' flight and thus knew of his elaborate narrative[208].

Themistokles was perhaps the most famous, but was of course not the only prominent Greek politician in exile in Persia[209]. According to Thukydides, Themistokles having been ostracized from Athens, first went to live in Argos. When the Spartans proposed that Themistokles be condemned in Athens on the charge of μηδισμός, he fled from

---

[205] Cf. Thuk. 1,137,3, Charon (*FGrHist* 262 F 11), Ephoros (*FGrHist* 70 F 190), Deinon (*FGrHist* 690 F 13), Kleitarchos (*FGrHist* 137 F 33), Herakleides (*FGrHist* 689 F 6) and Eratosthenes (*FGrHist* 241 F 27).

[206] Cf. the effective use of the dialogue between Artabanos and Themistokles to create the impression of ἐνάργεια.

[207] *FGrHist* 107; see also the supplementary commentary on Stesimbrotos in *FGrHist* IV A 1 1002 (Engels).

[208] For Themistokles' exile, see Frost (1980: 213-236) on Plut. *Them.* 27-32 and Hofstetter (1978: 171-176) s.v. Themistokles no. 305. Carawan (1989: 144-161) has maintained that Thukydides wanted to correct Stesimbrotos' older version, but a detailed analysis of both narratives makes this thesis improbable (cf. commentary on *FGrHist* IV A 1 1002).

[209] For prosopographical details on Greek envoys, counsellors or fugitives at the Persian court and for the historical context of F 20-22, see Hofstetter (1978) s.v. Antalkidas no. 18, Entimos no. 97, Themistokles no. 305 and Timagoras no. 320-322; also Hofstetter (1972: 94-107); on 5th-century relations between the Greeks and Persians after the Persian wars, see Lewis (1977) and Walser (1984).

Argos to Korkyra and from there to king Admetos of Molossia. The king sent the famous fugitive to the Macedonian city of Pydna. From there Themistokles took a ship and, travelling incognito, reached Ephesos in Asia Minor after some dramatic adventures. From Ephesos he wrote to King Artaxerxes, who had recently succeeded Xerxes. Then he began to learn Persian and after a year travelled to the king's court. Modern scholarly opinion assumes that he travelled to Persia and met king Artaxerxes in 465/64 B.C.[210]. The *chiliarch* Artabanos, who is introduced by P. as the person with whom Themistokles engages in a dialogue, killed Xerxes in 465 B.C. and tried to remove Artaxerxes I, in order to become king himself. But in the course of his assault on Artaxerxes, Artabanos himself was slain[211]. Themistokles stayed for some time at the court and was later rewarded with the revenues from some towns in Asia Minor (see below). He died as a Persian pensioner in Magnesia probably in 459 B.C.[212] and was buried there. Stories about his enforced suicide seem to be later inventions.

In chronological matters Plutarch considers Thukydides and Charon of Lampsakos to be more trustworthy than P. Having dealt with the chronology, he quotes a long passage from P., since he told such an impressive story. When P. makes the *chiliarch* say that it is not the Persian custom for the king to give ear to a man who has not paid him obeisance, this may be an ironic allusion to the extreme disobedience of Artabanos, who killed Xerxes. The dialogue between Themistokles and Artabanos may be a literary invention by P., designed to show Themistokles' rhetorical skill and courage. But the passage is not derived from an ἐγκώμιον on Themistokles, since P. not only makes him promise the great king that he will observe Persian customs, but also that he will induce more men to pay obeisance to him than were doing so at the time. Because of this promise Themistokles is described by P. as a traitor to the Hellenic cause and

---

210 PODLECKI (1975: 37-44 and 197) dates Themistokles' arrival in Persia to late 465 or early 464 B.C. after the assassination of Xerxes; there is a detailed discussion of Themistokles' flight in LENARDON (1978: 108-153); but see also VAN COMPERNOLLE (1987: 267-273) for the dissenting opinion that those ancient sources that state that Themistokles met Xerxes earlier in 465 B.C. should be given credit.

211 Cf. FROST (1980: 215 and n. 24).

212 The chronology of many events during the *Pentekontaetia*, including Themistokles' final years, remains obscure, see BADIAN (1993: 99-103), LEWIS (1992a: 1-14) and (1992b: 96-120), DAVIES (1992: 15-33) and RHODES (1992: 34-61); on the death of Themistokles see most recently MARR (1995: 159-167).

a political turncoat. Similar accusations had already been made against Themistokles by some contemporaries and in 5th-century historiography.

P., the Peripatetic philosopher, was interested in Themistokles' behaviour at the Persian court. He discussed the question of whether the Greek statesman would adopt all of the strange Persian court ceremonies, including the προσκύνησις, a ceremonial gesture of submission by a subject to the Persian king. On a more general level P. may also have discussed the moral problem of whether a Greek should perform the προσκύνησις at all. We do not know which of P.'s works F 20 is derived from and when exactly it was written. But if Themistokles promised Artabanos that he would obey all the customs of the country, that promise could have been understood by contemporaries of Alexander as an allusion to the well-known case of the Peripatetic philosopher-historian Kallisthenes, who had deliberately refused to perform the προσκύνησις. According to Thiel[213] the wording of the present fragment makes it clear that P. was familiar with the Aristotelian description of an oriental monarchy.

(21) F 21 is the only fragment on Themistokles which derives from Athenaios, whereas F 17-20 and 22 have been taken from Plutarch. In F 21 P. makes interesting observations about the Persian court system of feudal grants and royal gifts. As is natural in an ancient oriental monarchy, the king of Persia could promote individual subjects to the highest positions on the basis of their proven loyalty to him, without any regard for their place of origin or their former social position. But P. does not analyse the system of promotion or royal gifts[214] as a sociological or constitutional phenomenon, but significantly links it with biographical remarks and anecdotes about three famous Greeks of the 5th and 4th centuries, namely Entimos, Themistokles and Antalkidas. These are not listed in a strict chronological order. P. was more interested in biographical examples and anecdotes than in historical consistency. Entimos, from the city of Gortyn on Crete, was one of the early "imitators" of Themistokles and sought his fortune at the court of Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.). Possibly he travelled to Persia between 457/6 and 454/3 B.C. He was honoured by Artaxerxes with rich gifts, but, at least in Athenaios'

---

213 Thiel (1938: 208-210).

214 On the Persian system of royal gifts and grants with useful illustrations, see Walser (1966) and Wiesehöfer (1980: 7-21); on the king's *relatives* as an honorary title at the royal court, see Wiesehöfer (1994: 192) and Dandamaev – Lukonin (1989).

summary of P.'s original story, we are not told how Entimos earned them. He may have been useful in the king's diplomatic plans in regard to Sparta, as was suggested by Zecchini[215]. Entimos was even called to the "breakfast table of the king's relatives" (συγγενικὸν ἄριστον), although he was not a native Persian. P. mistakenly assumes that an invitation to this honorable position was restricted to actual relatives of the king. The *terminus technicus* probably derives from a Περσικά-work or from a history of Alexander by an author familiar with Persian ceremonial titles, among which was the high-ranking title of being one of the king's "relatives" (συγγενεῖς). As far as we know, no important military or political office was regularly connected with this title. One may imagine that Entimos was a royal counsellor who attended court in order to fulfil special tasks. P. may also have mentioned in his account the extraordinary honour paid to the Samian captain Phylakos, whose name was written down in the so-called "book of the benefactors of the King"[216].

Timagoras and Antalkidas lived in the 4th century. In the summer of 367 B.C. Timagoras[217] was sent as an envoy to the Persian court at Susa in order to plead the Athenian cause against a hostile Theban envoy[218]. After his return to Athens he was accused by his fellow-ambassador Leon of taking bribes from the Persian king and of conspiring with the Theban leader Pelopidas. He was then sentenced to death and executed. The Greek text of F 21 suggests that P. did not include Timagoras among his examples, although we cannot rule out the possibility that he was also named by him. Finally, P. reminded his readers of Antalkidas (or Antialkidas)[219] as an example of a Greek who was honoured at the king's court and thus followed in the foot-

---

[215] Cf. ZECCHINI (1989a: 7-12) and (1989b: 201 and n. 13); see also HOFSTETTER (1978: 55-56) s.v. Entimos no. 97 and WIEDERSICH (1924: 276). ZECCHINI (1989a: 12-13) suggested that P. may have regarded Entimos as a kind of pro-Persian tyrant and that F 21 may have been taken from P.'s treatise *Tyrants killed in Revenge*; but, at least in regard to Timagoras and Antalkidas, such a hypothesis is not convincing.

[216] Cf. HERODOT. 8,85 and WIESEHÖFER (1980); ARR. *Anab.* 7,11,1 reports that Alexander appointed some noble Persians to be his "relatives". They were promoted to be commanders in his army during the mutiny at Opis in 324 B.C.; the king's *relatives* enjoyed the privilege of greeting the king with a ceremonial kiss.

[217] Cf. HOFSTETTER (1978: 183-184) s.v. Timagoras no. 322; but see ZECCHINI (1989a: 5-6) for the possible explanation that we perhaps need to distinguish two persons named Timagoras, a man from Crete in the fifth century, and the famous member of the Athenian embassy in 367 B.C.

[218] Cf. XEN. *Hell.* 7,1,33 and TOD *GHI* II no. 139,1-4, an inscription in which Athens honours Strato, king of Sidon (about 367 B.C.).

[219] See HOFSTETTER (1978: 15-16) *s.v.* Antalkidas no. 18.

steps of Themistokles. In 387 Antalkidas travelled to the court of Artaxerxes II in order to negotiate the "Peace of Antalkidas" or the "King's Peace", the first example in an important series of common peace treaties (κοιναὶ εἰρήναι)[220]. Apart from the fact that all four of these prominent Greeks (Themistokles, Entimos, Timagoras and Antalkidas) had at a certain point in their political careers spent some time—but under very different circumstances and in a different position—at the Persian king's court and that they had been honoured by the king at that time, they do not have much in common. Thus P. was perhaps interested in collecting historical or biographical examples of famous Greeks at the Persian court.

(22) The most reliable ancient sources on Themistokles' later years mention three Greek towns in Asia Minor the revenues from which were given to him by the Persian king as a pension, namely Magnesia, Lampsakos and Myous[221]. This magnanimous donation was given to the former enemy as his "bread, wine and fish (or meat?)" (εἰς ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον καὶ ὄψον)[222]. Themistokles used Magnesia as his main place of residence; he issued coins there, and received an income of fifty talents per year from the city. After his death, a grave monument and a statue were erected for him in the *Agora*. His descendants were also honored in the city for a long time[223]. Whereas it is certain that in 465/64 B.C. Magnesia on the banks of Maiandros was under firm Persian control, doubts have been raised in regard to the two coastal cities of Lampsakos and Myous. Possibly they had come under the control of the Delian league in 465/64, in which case Themistokles would have received revenues only from Magnesia. But in the years round 460 B.C. Lampsakos and Myous belonged to a border-zone

---

[220] On the"*King's Peace*" and other κοινὴ-εἰρήνη-treaties see URBAN (1991) and JEHNE (1994).

[221] The main sources are THUK. 1,138,5, DIOD. 11,57,6-58,1, ARISTOD. 10,5, PLUT. *Bellone an pace* 328e, NEPOS *Them.* 10,2-3, SCHOL. ARISTOPH. *Equ.* 84 = NEANTHES *FGrHist* 84 F 17b; see HOFSTETTER (1978: 173) *s.v.* Themistokles no. 305, FROST (1980: 219-223) and BRIANT (1985: 53-72).

[222] BADIAN (1993: 193-194 n. 38) compares this passage with some of the Persepolis tablets, on which the portions given to persons in the king's suite were written: "they consist of food animals; grain or flour or bread; and wine (oil appears once). Fish would no doubt be substituted for a Greek more used to it than to meat"; see esp. the so-called *J-Texts* (PF 691-740: *Royal Provisions*) in HALLOCK (1969: 24-25 and 214-223).

[223] An honorary decree from Lampsakos, dated about the end of the 3rd century, bears testimony to an annual festivity commemorating Themistokles, see HOFSTETTER (1978: 173-174).

between the Persian empire and the Delian league, and thus there is nothing improbable about them being ruled by Themistokles as a pro-Persian "tyrant". There is no convincing reason to doubt Thukydides' narrative in regard to the three towns.

But P. and, following him, Neanthes and Athenaios[224] add a further two towns to this plausible list of three, namely Perkote and Palaiskepsis[225], which had been given to Themistokles "for his bedding and raiment" (εἰς στρωμνὴν καὶ ἀμπεχόνην). It seems that P. knew the passage in Thukydides on the three towns and wanted to improve this authoritative narrative by giving additional details, as he had done in F 20. It would be interesting to know whether the words indicating that the king gave the three towns to Themistokles "for bread, wine and meat (or fish)" formed a phrase regularly used in official Persian for royal donations to subjects and whether P. invented his similar formula of the two additional towns "for his bedding and raiment" in imitation of the official Persian phrase.

(23) Apparently Hesychios has brought together material from two different works in his *lemma* on κήρυκες. The first part of F 23 should be assigned to an antiquarian or historical treatise with special interests in genealogical and etymological questions about Athenian and Eleusinian cults and Athenian local history, whereas the second part, on wild and cultivated fig-trees, obviously comes from a botanical or agricultural treatise, perhaps from P.'s Περὶ φυτῶν. P. agrees with the proud family-tradition of the Eleusinian priestly clan of the Kerykes, which they derived from Keryx, the son of Hermes, and from Aglauros, one of the three daughters of king Kekrops[226]. Once more he does not follow the main tradition in a controversial question which we find in Pausanias, and according to which Keryx was the younger son of Eumolpos, but prefers the family-tradition of the Kerykes.

---

[224] Athen. 1,29f-30a; P. is not explicitly named as Athenaios' source, but see Wehrli on F 40, which comes from a passage in Athenaios immediately before the list of five towns is mentioned.

[225] On Perkote, a town situated in the Troas between Abydos and Lampsakos, cf. Strab. *Geogr.* 13,1,7 C. 586 and 13,1,20 C. 590; on Palaiskepsis in the valley of the Aisepos see Strab. *Geogr.* 13,1,45 C. 603 and 13,1,52 C. 607.

[226] Cf. Harp. K 52 Keaney *s.v.* Κήρυκες with reference to Isoc. *Paneg.* 17,157, who derives the clan of the Heralds (Kerykes) from Keryx, son of Hermes, as do P. and *IG* XIV 1389, an inscription on a monument of Herodes Atticus. But cf. Paus. 1,38,3 for Keryx as a son of Eumolpos in the more common version; on the genealogy of the Kerykes, see also Toepffer (1889: 81-82).

Hence this fragment confirms Plutarch's characterization of P. as a philosopher and a man well read in history, because we may assume that he knew both traditions.

Johannes Engels

Text editions and translations

D.J. Allen, *Aristotelis De Caelo* (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), Oxford 1936.
F.C. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia,* V: *351c-438e* (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1936 (=1969).
J. Bollansée, *The Biographical Fragments of Hermippos the Callimachean,* Diss. Leuven 1996.
J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca Oxoniensa,* 4 vol., Oxford 1835 (= Amsterdam 1963).
E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), I³, Leipzig 1949-52, II², Leipzig 1942.
D. Domingo-Forasté, *Claudius Aelianus, Epistulae et Fragmenta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Stuttgart 1994.
T. Dorandi, *Filodemo. Storia dei Filosofi. Platone e l'Academia (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento* (La scuola di Epicuro 12), Napoli 1991.
B. Einarson – Ph.H. de Lacy, *Plutarch's Moralia,* XIV: *1086c-1147a* (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1967.
W.W. Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence,* Part Two (Philosophia Antiqua 54,2), Leiden 1992.
K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri* (Supplementum Platonicum 1), Stuttgart - Bad Canstatt 1988.
G. Giannantoni, *Socraticorum reliquiae* (Elenchos 7), 4 vol., Roma 1983-1985.
G. Giannantoni, *Socratis et socraticorum reliquiae* (Elenchos 18), 4 vol., Napoli 1990.
M.W. Haslam *e.a.*, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* Vol. 53, London 1986.
R. Hercher, *Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia Epistulae Fragmenta,* I-II (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1864-1866 (= Graz 1971).
R.D. Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers,* I (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1925 (= 1950).
F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente* (Philologische Untersuchungen 16), Berlin 1902 (= New York 1973).
F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium,* Berlin 1904.
G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratitae Dipnosophistarum libri XV,* I-III (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1887-1890.
J.J. Keaney, *Harpocration. Lexeis of the Ten Orators,* Amsterdam 1991.
K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon,* II, København 1966.
M. Manfredini – L. Piccirilli, *Plutarco. La vita di Solone,* Verona - Milano 1977.

E. Martini, *Parthenii Nicaeni quae supersunt* (Mythographi Graeci, II.1 suppl.) (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1902.
S. Mekler, *Academicorum philosophorum Index Herculanensis*, Berlin 1902.
C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, II, Paris 1878.
D.L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
B. Perrin, *Plutarch's Lives,* I (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1914 (= 1967).
B. Perrin, *Plutarch's Lives,* II (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1914 (= 1968).
H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, I, Leipzig 1914 (= Stuttgart 1967).
M. Pohlenz, *Plutarchus Moralia*, VI 2 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1952.
H. Rackham, *Aristoteles, The Eudemian Ethics* (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1935 (= 1971).
H. Rackham, *Aristoteles, The Nicomachean Ethics* (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1926 (= 1975).
S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, IV, *Sophocles*, Göttingen 1977.
V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1886[3].
F. Scheidweiler, *Euphorionis fragmenta*, Diss. Bonn 1908.
I. Scott-Kilvert, *The Rise and Fall of Athens. Nine Greek Lives by Plutarch*, London 1960.
O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, II.: *Stromata* Buch I-VI (*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte)*, Leipzig 1906; revised edition by L. Früchtel Berlin 1960[3].
F.G. Stallbaum, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam,* I-II, Leipzig 1825-26 (= Hildesheim 1970).
P. Steinmetz, *Theophrast Charaktere herausgegeben und erläutert von P. Steinmetz,* I-II (Das Wort der Antike VII), München 1960-1962.
M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, I, Leiden 1971.
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar,* Heft I. *Dikaiarchos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1967[2].
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar,* Heft II. *Aristoxenos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1967[2].
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar,* Heft III. *Klearchos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1969[2] (= 1969a).
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Heft IV. *Demetrios von Phaleron*, Basel - Stuttgart 1968[2].
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar,* Heft VII. *Herakleides Pontikos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1969[2] (= 1969b).
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Heft IX. *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes*, Basel - Stuttgart 1969[2] (= 1969c).
F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar,* Suppl. I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel - Stuttgart 1974.
M.L. West, *Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, I, Oxford 1989[2], II, Oxford 1992[2].

A. Westermann, ΜΥΘΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. *Scriptores Poeticae Historiae Graeci*, Braunschweig 1843.
F. Wimmer, *Theophrasti Eresii opera quae supersunt omnia*, III: *Fragmenta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1862.
K. Ziegler, *Plutarchus Vitae Parallelae,* I.1 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1969[4].

Secondary literature

K. Alpers, *Griechische Lexikographie in Antike und Mittelalter. Dargestellt an ausgewählten Beispielen*, in H.-A. Koch – A. Krup-Ebert (ed.), *Welt der Information. Wissen und Wissensvermittlung in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Stuttgart 1990, p. 14-38.
S.P. Arrowsmith, *The Tyranny in Athens in the Sixth Century B.C.*, I-II., Diss. Manchester 1988.
J.E. Atkinson, *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni Books 3 and 4*, Amsterdam 1980.
J. Auberger, *Ctésias, Histoires de l'Orient*, Paris 1991.
E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea. Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia*, Baltimore - London 1993.
E. Barker, *Greek Political Thought. Plato and his Predecessors*, London - New York 1918 (= 1960).
A. Bauer – F.J. Frost, *Themistokles. Literary, Epigraphical and Archaeological Testimonia*, Chicago 1967[2] (a revised and enlarged english edition of A. Bauer, *Plutarch's Themistokles für quellenkritische Übungen*, Leipzig 1884).
K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, III, 2, Strasbourg1923[2].
H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, I-II, München 1967.
J.M. Bigwood, *Ctesias as Historian of the Persian Wars*, in *Phoenix* 32 (1978), p. 19-41.
J. Boardman – N.G.L.Hammond – D.M. Lewis – M. Ostwald (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, IV[2]: *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, Cambridge 1988[2].
L. Bodin, *Histoire et biographie—Phanias d'Érèse*, part 1 in *REG* 28 (1915), p. 251-281 and part 2 in *REG* 30 (1917), p. 117-157.
P. Blome, *Lefkandi und Homer*, in WJA n.F. 10 (1984), p. 9-21.
P. Blome, *Die dunklen Jahrhunderte—aufgehellt*, in *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung. Rückblick und Ausblick*, Stuttgart - Leipzig 1991, p. 45-60.
P. Bonnechère, *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*, Athenai - Liège 1994.
P. Bonnechère, *La ΠΟΜΠΗ sacrificielle des victimes humaines en Grèce ancienne*, in *REA* 99 (1997) p. 63-89.
A.B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, I: *commentary on books I-III*, Oxford 1980.
F. Bourriot, *Kalos Kagathos, Kalokagathia. D'un terme de propagande de sophistes à une notion sociale et philosophique. Étude d'histoire athénienne*, I-II, Hildesheim 1995.
C.M. Bowra, *Simonides and Scopas*, in*CPh* 29 (1934), p. 230-239.
J. Bremmer, *Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece*, in *HSPh* 87 (1983), p. 299-320.

P. Briant, *Dons de terres et de villes: L'Asie Mineure dans le contexte achéménide*, in *REA* 87 (1985), p. 53-72.
K.O. Brink, art. *Peripatos*, in RE Suppl. 7 (1940), col. 899-949.
W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley - London 1979.
W. Burkert, *Homo necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1983.
W. Burkert, Review of D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, London - New York 1991, in *Gnomon* 66 (1994), p. 97-100.
A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks. The Defense of the West 546-478 B.C.*, London 1984².
G. Camassa, *La Biografia*, in *Lo Spazio Letterario della Grecia antica*, I, 1, Roma 1994, p. 303-332
E.M. Carawan, *Thucydides and Stesimbrotos on the Exile of Themistocles*, in *Historia* 38 (1989), p. 144-161.
B. Caven, *Dionysius I, War-Lord of Sicily*, New Haven - London 1990.
H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition. Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen*, Oxford 1966 (= 1985).
M. Chambers. *Aristoteles. Der Staat der Athener*, Berlin 1990.
S. Charitonidis, *Ἐπιγραφαί Λέσβου-Συμπλήρωμα*, Athenai 1968.
W. Clarysse – G. Schepens, *A Ptolemaic Fragment of an Alexander History*, in *CE* 60 (1985), p. 30-47.
L. Cohn, *Griechische Lexikographie*, in K. Brugmann (ed.), *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1913⁴ (= *HdAW* II,1), p. 679-730.
G. Comotti, *Music in Greek and Roman Culture*, Baltimore - London 1989 (= 1991).
C. Cooper, *Phaenias of Eresus on Solon and Themistocles*, in *EMC* 39 n.s. 14 (1995), p. 323-335.
E. Culasso Gastaldi, *Ps.-Demosthenes XVII: appunti di cronologia*, in *Prometheus* 6 (1980), p. 233-242.
M.A. Dandamaev – V.C. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*, Cambridge 1989.
J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.
J.K. Davies, *Greece after the Persian Wars,* in D.M.Lewis – J. Boardman – J.K. Davies – M. Ostwald (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* V: *The Fifth Century*, Cambridge 1992², p. 15-33.
W. den Boer, *Themistocles in Fifth Century Historiography*, in: *Mnemosyne* 15 (1962), p. 225-237 (= den Boer, *ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ. Studies in Graeco-Roman History*, ed. by H.W. Pleket – H.S. Versnel – M.A. Ves, Leiden 1979, p. 54-66).
A. Dihle, *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*, Göttingen 1970².
A. Dihle, *Die Entstehung der historischen Biographie*, Heidelberg 1987.
P. Ducrey, *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris 1968.
J. Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria*, New York 1974.
W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London 1911 (= Chicago 1974).
Ch. Fort, *Das Buch der Verdammten*, Frankfurt am Main 1995.
P.M. Frazer – E. Matthews (ed.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, I: The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*, Oxford 1987.
F.J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary*, Princeton 1980.

V. Gabrielsen, *Financing the Athenian Fleet. Public Taxation and Social Relations*, Baltimore - London 1994.
F.A. Gevaert, *Historie et théorie de la musique de l'antiquité*, I-II, Gent 1875 (= Hildesheim 1965).
M. Gigante, *Catalogo dei Papiri Ercolanesi*, Napoli 1979.
R. Girard, *The Scapegoat*, London 1986.
R. Girard, *Job: The Victim of his People*, London 1987 (= 1987a).
R. Girard, *Das Heilige und die Gewalt*, Zürich 1987 (= 1987b).
G. Glotz, *Les fêtes d'Adonis sous Ptolémée II*, in *REG* 33 (1920) p. 169-222.
A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I, Oxford 1945 (= 1971).
C. Habicht, *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*, München 1995.
R.T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Chicago 1969.
N.G.L. Hammond, *The Expedition of Xerxes*, in J. Boardman – N.G.L. Hammond – D.M. Lewis – M. Ostwald (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, IV: *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, Cambridge 1988[2], p. 518-591.
A. Henrichs, *Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies*, in J. Rudhardt – O. Reverdin (ed.), *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, Vandoeuvres - Genève 1981, p. 195-235 and discussion p. 236-242.
R. Hercher, *Ueber die Glaubwürdigkeit der Neuen Geschichte des Ptolemaeus Chennus*, in *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 1, Leipzig 1856, p. 269-293.
F. Hiller von Gärtringen, *IG XII Supplementum*, Berlin 1939.
H. Hörhager, *Zu den Flottenoperationen am Kap Artemision*, in *Chiron* 3 (1973), p. 43-59.
J. Hofstetter, *Zu den griechischen Gesandtschaften nach Persien*, in G. Walser (ed.), *Beiträge zur Achämenidengeschichte*, Wiesbaden 1972, p. 94-107.
J. Hofstetter, *Die Griechen in Persien. Prosopographie der Griechen im persischen Reich vor Alexander*, Berlin 1978.
H. Homeyer, *Beobachtungen zu den hellenistischen Quellen der Plutarch-Viten*, in *Klio* 41 (1963), p. 145-157.
J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford 1981.
D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, London - New York 1991.
S. Jackson, *Myrsilus of Methymna: Hellenistic Paradoxographer*, Leiden 1995.
F. Jacoby, *Über das Marmor Parium*, in *RhM 59* (1904), p. 63-107 (= *Kleine philologische Schriften*, I, Berlin 1961, p. 521-559) (= 1904b).
F. Jacoby, *The Date of Archilochos*, in *CQ* 35 (1941), p. 97-109 (= *Kleine Philologische Schriften*, I, Berlin 1961, p. 249-267).
M. Jehne, *Koine Eirene. Untersuchungen zu den Befriedungs- und Stabilisierungsbemühungen in der griechischen Poliswelt des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1994.
B. Jordan, *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1975.
J. Kaerst, art. *Chairon* (4), in *RE* 3,2 (1899), col. 2032-2033.
R. Kassel, *Wagemutige Liebhaber*, in *RhM* 117 (1974), p. 190-191.
G. Knaack, art. *Eresios* (2), in *RE* 6,1 (1907), col. 420.
F.W. König, *Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos*, Graz 1972.
E. Krummen, *Texte zur frühgriechischen Musik- und Literaturgeschichte*, unpubl. Habilitationsschrift Bern 1995.
G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Paris 1996.
R.J. Lane Fox, *Theophrastus' Characters and the Historian*, in *PCPS* 42 (1996) 127-170.

R. LAQUEUR, art. *Phainias aus Eresos*, in *RE* 19,1 (1938), col. 1565-1591.
F.J. LAZENBY, *Aischylos and Salamis*, in *Hermes* 116 (1988), p. 168-185.
R.J. LENARDON, *The Saga of Themistocles*, London 1978.
F. LEO, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*, Leipzig 1901 (= Hildesheim 1965).
A. LESKY, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern - München 1971³.
D.M. LEWIS, *Sparta and Persia*, Leiden 1977.
D.M. LEWIS, *Sources, Chronology, Method*, in D.M. LEWIS – J. BOARDMAN – J.K. DAVIES – M. OSTWALD (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, V: *The Fifth Century*, Cambridge 1992², p. 1-14 (= 1992a).
D.M. LEWIS, *Mainland Greece*, in D.M. LEWIS – J. BOARDMAN – J.K. DAVIES – M. OSTWALD (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, V: *The Fifth Century*, Cambridge 1992² , p. 96-120 (= 1992b).
S.R.C. LILLA, *Clement of Alexandreia. A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, Oxford 1971.
R.J. LITTMAN, *Kinship and Politics in Athens 600-400 B.C.*, New York - Bern 1990.
J.B. LOTT, *Philip II, Alexander, and the Two Tyrannies at Eresos of IG XII.2.526*, in *Phoenix* 50 (1996) p. 26-40.
P. MAAS, art. *Stratonikos* (2), in *RE* 4,1 (1931), col. 326-327.
M. MAASS, *Das antike Delphi. Orakel, Schätze und Monumente*, Darmstadt 1993.
G. MADDOLI, *Il VI e V secolo a.C.*, in E. GABBA – G. VALLET (ed.), *La Sicilia antica*, II,1: *Dal VI secolo a.C. alle guerre puniche*, Napoli 1980, p. 1-102.
P.B. MANVILLE, *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*, Princeton 1990.
G. MARASCO, *Cherone di Pellene: un tiranno del IV secolo a. C.*, in F. BROILO (ed.), *Xenia. Scritti in onore di Piero Treves*, Roma 1985, p. 111-119.
J. MARR, *The Death of Themistocles*, in *G&R* 42 (1995), p. 159-167.
J. MEJER, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978.
E. MEYER, *Die Biographie Kimons*, in *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, II, Halle 1899, p. 1-87.
E. MEYER, art. *Pellene*, in *RE* 19,1 (1937), col. 354-367.
E.H.F. MEYER, *Geschichte der Botanik*, I, Königsberg 1854.
C. MOSSÉ, *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique*, Paris 1969.
A.A. MOSSHAMMER, *Phainias of Eresos and Chronology*, in *CSCA* 10 (1977), p. 105-132.
A.A. MOSSHAMMER, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*, Cranbury - London 1979.
M. MÜHL, *Solon und der Historiker Phainias von Lesbos*, in *RhM* 98 (1955), p. 349-354.
M. MÜHL, *Solon gegen Peisistratos. Ein Beitrag zur peripatetischen Geschichtsschreibung*, in *RhM* 99 (1956), p. 315-323.
P. von der MÜHLL, *Antiker Historismus in Plutarchs Biographie des Solon*, in *Klio* 35 (1942), p. 89-102.
W. NESTLE – W. LIEBICH, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Berlin 1961³.
A.J. NEUBECKER, *Altgriechische Musik. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1977.
F. OVERBECK – C.A. BERNOUILLI – L. FRÜCHTEL, *Titus Flavius Klemens von Alexandreia: Die Teppiche*, Basel 1936.
L. PEARSON, *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and His Predecessors*, Atlanta 1987.

C.B.R. Pelling, *Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography,* in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature,* Oxford 1990, p. 213-244.
H. Pistorius, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Lesbos im vierten Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Diss. Jena 1913.
A.J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles. A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence*, Montreal 1975.
A.J. Podlecki – S. Duane, *A Survey of Work on Plutarch's Greek Lives, 1951-1988*, in *ANRW* II 33.6, Berlin - New York 1992, p. 4053-4127.
W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War, Part 3. Religion*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1979.
O. Regenbogen, art.*Theophrastos* (3), in *RE Suppl.* 7 (1940), col. 1354-1562.
R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*, Leipzig 1897.
P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981.
P.J. Rhodes, *The Delian League to 449 B.C.*, in D.M. Lewis – J. Boardman – J.K. Davies – M. Ostwald (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, V: *The Fifth Century*, Cambridge 1992^2 , p. 34-61.
T.E. Rihll, *'EKTHMOPOI: Partners in Crime?*, in *JHS* 111 (1991), p. 101-127.
J. Rives, *Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians*, in *JRS* 85 (1995), p. 65-85.
C. Rolley, *Fouilles de Delphes* V 2: *Monuments figurés*: *Les statuettes de bronze*, Paris 1969.
G. Roux, *Eschyle, Hérodote, Diodore, Plutarque racontent la bataille de Salamine*, in *BCH* 98 (1974), p. 51-94.
E. Ruschenbusch, *ΣΟΛΩΝΟΣ ΝΟΜΟΙ—Die Fragmente des solonischen Gesetzeswerkes mit einer Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte*, Wiesbaden 1966 (= 1983).
E. Ruschenbusch, *Plutarchs Solonbiographie*, in *ZPE* 100 (1994), p. 351-380.
L.J. Sanders, *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*, London 1987.
G. Schepens, *Politics and Belief in Timaeus of Tauromenium*, in *AncSoc* 24 (1994), p. 249-278.
G. Schepens – K. Delcroix, *Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception*, in O. Pecere – A. Stramaglia (ed.), *La Letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, Cassino 1996, p. 373-460.
E. Schütrumpf, *Aristoteles Politik Buch 1*, Berlin 1991.
E. Schwartz, art. *Dinon* (2), in *RE* 5 (1903), col. 654.
F. Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, Gießen 1915 (= Berlin 1966).
H.A. Shapiro, *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens*, Mainz 1989.
M. Sordi, *La Dynasteia in Occidente* (Studi su Dionigi I), Padova 1992.
P.A. Stadter (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, London - New York 1992.
M. Stein, *Definition und Schilderung in Theophrasts Charakteren*, Stuttgart 1992.
J. Stern, *Parthenius. Erotika Pathemata. The Love Stories of Parthenius*, New York - London 1992.
K.F. Stroheker, *Dionysios I. Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus*, Wiesbaden 1958.
R.S. Stroud, *The Axones and Kyrbeis of Drakon and Solon*, Berkeley 1979.
D.R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, Berkeley 1928.
C. Theander, *Plutarch und die Geschichte*, Lund 1950-1951.

J.H. THIEL, *Solon und Pittakos*, in *Mnemosyne* 3. ser. 6 (1938), p. 204-210.
J.H. THIEL, *Solon en de tyrannis*, in M. DAVID – B.A. VAN GRONINGEN – E.M. MEIJERS (ed.), *Symbola ad jus et historiam antiquitatis pertinentes Julio Christiano van Oven dedicatae*, Leiden 1946, p. 71-81.
J. TOEPFFER, *Attische Genealogie*, Berlin 1889.
K.-H. TOMBERG, *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaios Chennos. Eine literarhistorische und quellenkritische Untersuchung*, Diss. Bonn 1967.
K. TRAMPEDACH, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994.
J. VON UNGERN-STERNBERG, *Zur Beurteilung Dionysios' I. von Syrakus*, in W. WILL – J. HEINRICHS (ed.), *Zu Alexander dem Großen, Festschrift für G. Wirth*, II, Amsterdam 1988, p. 1123-1151.
R. URBAN, *Der Königsfrieden von 387/86 v. Chr. Vorgeschichte, Zustandekommen, Ergebnis und politische Umsetzung*, Stuttgart 1991.
R. VAN COMPERNOLLE, *Une tradition achéménide sur l'exil de Thémistocle?*, in J. SERVAIS – T. HACKENS – B. SERVAIS-SOYEZ (ed.), *Stemmata. Mélanges de philologie, d'histoire et d'archéologie grecques offerts à J. Labarbe*, Liège - Louvain-La-Neuve 1987, p. 267-273.
R. VATTUONE, *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio*, Bologna 1991.
G. WALSER, *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis*, Berlin 1966.
G. WALSER, *Hellas und Iran*, Darmstadt 1984.
H. WANKEL, *Kalos kai Agathos*, Diss. Würzburg 1961 (= New York 1979).
F. WEHRLI, *Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit*, in H. FLASHAR (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, 3: *Ältere Akademie. Aristoteles-Peripatos*, Basel - Stuttgart 1983 (= *Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie* begründet von F. UEBERWEG. Völlig neubearbeitete Ausgabe), p. 461-473.
G. WENTZEL, art. *Asklepiades* (29), in *RE* 2,2 (1896), col. 1631.
M.L. WEST, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.
A. WIEDERSICH, art. *Entimos* (1a), in *RE* Suppl. 4 (1924), col. 276.
J. WIESEHÖFER, *Die "Freunde" und "Wohltäter" des Großkönigs*, in *Studia Iranica* 9 (1980), p. 7-21.
J. WIESEHÖFER, *Das antike Persien von 550 v. Chr. bis 650 n. Chr.*, München - Zürich 1994.
A. WÖRLE, *Die politische Tätigkeit der Schüler Platons*, 1981.
G. ZECCHINI, *Entimo di Gortina (Athen. II, 48d-f) e le relazioni greco-persiane durante la pentecontetia*, in *AncSoc* 20 (1989), p. 5-13 (= 1989a).
G. ZECCHINI, *La cultura storica di Ateneo*, Milano 1989 (= 1989b).

Concordance of the numbers of testimonies and fragments in Wehrli and in *FGrHist* IV A 1:

Wehrli	*FGrHist* IV
F 1	T 1
F 2	T 2
F 3	T 3
F 4	T 4
F 5	T 5
F 6	T 6
F 7	T 7
F 11	F 1
F 13	F 2
F 14	F 3
F 15	F 4
F 16	F 5
Hermippos F 89	F 6
F 17a/b	F 7
F 18	F 8
F 19	F 9
F 33	F 10
F 30	F 11
F 31	F 12
F 32	F 13
F 20	F 14
F 21	F 15
F 22a/b	F 16a/b
F 23	F 17
F 24	F 18
F 25	F 19
F 26	F 20
F 27	F 21
F 28	F 22
F 29	F 23

This page intentionally left blank

— (= 72). Anaximenes of Lampsakos

ΠΕΡΙ ΟΜΗΡΟΥ

cf. *FGrHist* IV B

—. Dikaiarchos of Messene

ΒΙΟΙ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩΝ

cf. *FGrHist* IV C

—. Herakleides Pontikos

.

cf. *FGrHist* IV B

1013 (= 337bis). Philiskos of Miletos

(c. 405/400-320/310 B.C.)

T

1a (= HESYCHIOS *FHG* IV p. 177 F 71) HESYCHIOS, ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑΙ ΔΙΑΛΑΜΨΑΝΤΩΝ (ΣΟΦΩΝ): Φιλίσκον τὸν Μιλήσιον ῥήτορα, πρότερον αὐλητὴν ὄντα παραδοξότατον, Ἰσοκράτης ὁ ῥήτωρ αὐλοτρύπην ἐκάλεσεν. **1b** (= *FHG* -; only partly printed as *FGrHist* 496 F 9) *Suda* **Φ** 360 *s.v.* **Φιλίσκος**· Μιλήσιος, ῥήτωρ, Ἰσοκράτους ἀκουστὴς τοῦ ῥήτορος. ἐγένετο δὲ πρότερον αὐλητὴς παραδοξότατος· διὸ καὶ αὐλοτρύπην Ἰσοκράτης αὐτὸν ἐκάλει. Γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ τάδε· Μιλησιακός, Ἀμφικτυονικός (*FGrHist* 496 F 9), Τέχνη ῥητορικὴ (RADERMACHER B XXXII 1) ἐν βιβλίοις δυσίν, Ἰσοκράτους ἀποφάσεις.

2 (= *FHG* -) DION. HALIK. *Isaeus* 19 p. 122,10-17 USENER – RADERMACHER: Οὐ δὴ δεῖν ᾠόμην Ἰσοκράτους ἐν ἅπασι πάντων τούτων ὑπερέχοντος λόγον τινὰ ποιεῖσθαι περὶ ἐκείνων οὐδέ γε περὶ τῶν συμβιωσάντων Ἰσοκράτει καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἐκείνου ἐκμιμησαμένων οὐθενός, Θεοδέκτου λέγω καὶ Θεοπόμπου καὶ Ναυκράτους, Ἐφόρου τε καὶ Φιλίσκου καὶ Κηφισοδώρου καὶ ἄλλων συχνῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι κρίνεσθαι πρὸς τὴν Ἰσοκράτους δύναμίν εἰσιν ἐπιτήδειοι.

3 (= *FHG* -) DION. HALIK. *Epist. Amm.* 2 p. 258,20-259,13 USENER – RADERMACHER: ἵνα μὴ τοῦθ' ὑπολάβωσιν, ὅτι πάντα περιείληφεν ἡ περιπατητικὴ φιλοσοφία τὰ ῥητορικὰ παραγγέλματα, καὶ οὔτε οἱ περὶ Θεόδωρον καὶ Θρασύμαχον καὶ Ἀντιφῶντα σπουδῆς ἄξιον οὐδὲν εὗρον οὔτε Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Ἀναξιμένης και Ἀλκίδαμας οὔτε οἱ τούτοις συμβιώσαντες τοῖς ἀνδράσι παραγγελμάτων τεχνικῶν συγγραφεῖς καὶ ἀγωνισταὶ λόγων ῥητορικῶν, οἱ περὶ Θεοδέκτην καὶ Φιλίσκον και Ἰσαῖον καὶ Κηφισόδωρον Ὑπερείδην τε καὶ

---

8 Τέχνην ῥητορικὴν *A* **9** ἀπόφασις *om. F* : ἀποφάσεις *coni. Blass* **11** δὲ *P corr. Usener – Radermacher in* δὴ **11** δεῖ *F corr F*[1] **11** οἰόμην *in marg.* : ᾠόμην *B* **11** οὐθενός *FAV* : οὐδενός *PB Usener – Radermacher* (= *TB Aujac*) **14** καὶ ναυκράτους-κρίνεσθαι πρὸς τὴν *om. in M suppl. m uetusta atramento eodem usa sed signis rubris* : Ναυσικράτους *alibi audit* **14** φιλίστου *libri (i.e. FZ Aujac)* : *corr. Göller* **15** συγκρίνεσθαι *van Vliet non necessario* **19** θεορθεόδωρον *P* **20** θρασύμμαχον *P* **22** λόγων ῥητόρων ῥητορικῶν *P* **23** οἱ περὶ ῥίδην (*marg. corr.* ὑπερίδην) *ceteris omissis B* **23** φίλιστον *M O P s* : *corr. Sylburg* **23** ὑπερίδην *libri* : *corr. Herwerden*

1013 (= 337bis). Philiskos of Miletos
(c. 405/400-320/310 B.C.)

T

1a Isokrates the orator called Philiskos, the orator of Miletos, who in his earlier days had been reputed to be a most admirable flute-player, the "flute-borer".
1b Philiskos of Miletos, orator, disciple of the orator Isokrates. In his early years he was a most admirable flute-player; and therefore Isokrates used to call him "flute-borer". He wrote the following works: A *Milesian Speech* and an *Amphictyonic Speech*, a technical *Treatise on Rhetoric* in two volumes, and a *Collection of Famous Sayings of Isokrates*.

2 Therefore, taking into consideration Isokrates' excellence over all these orators in all respects, I have not deemed it necessary to speak of them nor of Isokrates' contemporaries who imitated his style of writing, such as Theodektes, Theopompos and Naukrates, or Ephoros, Philiskos and Kephisodoros and many others. For they all cannot bear comparison with Isokrates' powerful expression.

3 In order that they do not suppose that all precepts of rhetoric are comprehended in the Peripatetic philosophy, and that nothing important was discovered by Theodoros, Thrasymachos, Antiphon and their associates; nor by Isokrates, Anaximenes, Alkidamas or their companions who composed rhetorical handbooks and engaged in oratorical contests: Theodektes, Philiskos, Isaios, Kephisodoros, Hypereides, Lykurgos, Aischines and all

Λυκοῦργον καὶ Αἰσχίνην, οὐδ’ <ἂν> αὐτὸς ὁ Δημοσθένης ὁ πάντας ὑπερβαλόμενος τούς τε πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς καθ’ ἑαυτὸν καὶ μηδὲ τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπερβολὴν καταλιπὼν τοσοῦτος ἐγένετο τοῖς Ἰσοκράτους τε καὶ Ἰσαίου κοσμούμενος παραγγέλμασιν, εἰ μὴ τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνας ἐξέμαθεν.

4 (= *FHG* -) Cic. *De or.* II 94: atque et illi, Theopompi, Ephori, Philisci, Naucratae multique alii naturis differunt, voluntate autem similes sunt et inter sese et magistri.

5 (= *FHG* -) Anonymous ΒΙΟΣ ΙΣΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ, l. 99-106 Mathieu – Brémond, p. XXXV-XXXVI: Ἔσχε δὲ μαθητὰς πολλοὺς μέν, τοὺς δὲ εὐδοκιμηκότας καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς τούτους· Θεόπομπον (*FGrHist* 115 T 5), Ἔφορον (*FGrHist* 70 T 3), ὧν καὶ ἱστορίαι φέρονται· Ὑπερείδην, Ἰσαῖον, Λυκοῦργον, οἵτινές εἰσι τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων τῶν κριθέντων καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένων· εἶτα Φιλίσκον, Ἰσοκράτην ὁμώνυμον αὐτοῦ, Θεοδέκτην (Radermacher B XXXVII), Ἀνδροτίωνα (*FGrHist* 324 T 2b) τὸν τὴν Ἀτθίδα γράψαντα, καθ’ οὗ καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης ἔγραψε (Demosth. *or.* 22), καὶ Πύθωνα τὸν Βυζάντιον, τὸν ῥήτορα Φιλίππου.

6 (= *FHG* I p. 193 = *FGrHist* 566 T 1) *Suda* T 602 *s.v.* Τίμαιος, Ἀνδρομάχου, Ταυρομενείτης· ὃν Ἀθηναῖοι Ἐπιτίμαιον ὠνόμασαν· Φιλίσκου μαθητὴς τοῦ Μιλησίου.

7 (= *FHG* III p. 2 = *FGrHist* 84 T 1a) *Suda* N 114 *s.v.* Νεάνθης· Κυζικηνός, ῥήτωρ, μαθητὴς Φιλίσκου τοῦ Μιλησίου.

8 (= *FHG* -) Plut. *Vit. X or.* 836c (Mau with modifications): ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν (*sc.* Lysias) ἐπίγραμμα (*cf.* Bergk II, no. XLII p. 640-641; West II, p. 94-95) Φιλίσκος ὁ Ἰσοκράτους μὲν γνώριμος, ἑταῖρος δὲ Λυσίου, δι’ οὗ φανερὸν ὡς προέλαβε τοῖς ἔτεσιν, ὃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος (*cf.* Plat. *Phaedr.* 278e-279b) εἰρημένων ἀποδείκνυται· ἔχει δὲ οὕτως·

<νῦν> ὦ Καλλιόπης θύγατερ, πολυήγορε Φρόντι,
δείξεις εἴ τι φρονεῖς καί τι περισσὸν ἔχεις·
τῷ γὰρ ἐς ἄλλο σχῆμα μεθαρμοσθέντι καὶ ἄλλοις
ἐν κόσμοισι βίου σῶμα λαβόνθ’ ἕτερον

---

24 οὐδ’ ἂν] οὔτε *libri* : οὐδ’ *Sauppe* **25** ὑπερβαλλόμενος *P* **25** αὐτοῦ *M B* **26** γενησομένοις *s* **26** ἐγένετο] ἂν : ἐγ. *Morello auctore uolgatur* **29** *codd. Philisti* : *em. Göller* **42** ὃν-ὠνόμασαν *post* Μιλησίου *transp. praeunte. Bernhardy Daub, qui* Ἀθήναιος-ὠνόμασε *coll. Athen.* 6,272b *vel, quod melius*, Ἀθηναῖοι *del.* **45** Μιλυσίου *V* : Μελησίου *A* **49** φανερόν ἐστιν ὡς *E* **49** ὃ *om. E*

their associates. Even Demosthenes himself, who surpassed all his predecessors and contemporaries, and left his successors with no scope for improvement, would not have achieved such greatness if he had equipped himself only with the precepts of Isokrates and Isaios, and had not thoroughly mastered the handbooks of Aristotle.

4 And indeed the former group of orators, such as Theopompos, Ephoros, Philiskos, Naukrates and many more, though differing in their natural gifts, nevertheless resemble one another, and also their master, in their minds.

5 He (*i.e.* Isokrates) had many pupils, among whom the most famous and best known are the following: Theopompos and Ephoros, who both also wrote *Histories*; Hypereides, Isaios, Lykurgos, who belong to the ten classical orators and whose works are still read; moreover Philiskos, a homonymous disciple named Isokrates, Theodektes, Androtion, the author of the *Local History of Athens*, against whom Demosthenes wrote; and Python of Byzantion, the orator who was in service with King Philip II.

6 Timaios, son of Andromachos of Tauromenion, whom the Athenians nicknamed "Epitimaios" ("the faultfinder"), a disciple of Philiskos of Miletos.

7 Neanthes of Kyzikos, an orator; he was a disciple of Philiskos of Miletos.

8 Philiskos, who was a pupil of Isokrates and a companion of Lysias, wrote a funeral epigram on him (*sc.* Lysias), from which it is obvious, that he (*sc.* Lysias) was older, a fact which is also confirmed by Plato's words. The epigram reads as follows:

<Now>, daughter of Kalliope, Phrontis with Your abundance of words, You will show the measure of Your intelligence and Your superior talent of invention.
In honour of the one who has taken another form and another body in another world of life

δεῖ σ’ ἀρετῆς κήρυκα τεκεῖν τινα Λυσίᾳ ὕμνον,
δόντα καταφθιμένῳ † καὶ σοφῷ † ἀθάνατον,
ὅς τό τ’ ἐμῆς ψυχῆς δείξει φιλέταιρον ἅπασι,
καὶ τὴν τοῦ φθιμένου πᾶσι βροτοῖς’ ἀρετήν.

9 (= *FHG* I p. 185 = *FGrHist* 556 T 1b) *Suda* Φ 365 *s.v.* Φίλιστος· Ναυκρατίτης ἤ Συρακόσιος, ’Αρχωνίδου υἱός, μαθητὴς δὲ ἦν Εὐήνου (Diehl I^3, p. 92ff) τοῦ ἐλεγειοποιοῦ· ὃς πρῶτος κατὰ τὴν ῥητορικὴν τέχνην ἱστορίαν ἔγραψε. συνέταξε δὲ Τέχνην ῥητορικήν (Radermacher B XX 1 and B XXXII 1), Αἰγυπτιακὰ ἐν βιβλίοις ιβ', Σικελικὰ ἐν βιβλίοις ια', Πρὸς τὸν Τρικάρανον· Λόγον περὶ Ναυκράτεως, Περὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ τυράννου βιβλία ς', Περὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων θεολογίας βιβλία γ', Δημηγορίας· καὶ ἄλλα τινά. Περὶ Συρίας καὶ Λιβύης.

F

1. ΒΙΟΣ ΛΥΚΟΥΡΓΟΥ (?)
(F 1)

1 (*FHG* -; *FGrHist* 337bis) Olymp. *Comm. Plat. in Gorg.* 515c Westerink 41,10 p. 215,23-27): καὶ πάλιν ὁ Φιλίσκος τὸν βίον γράφων τοῦ Λυκούργου φησὶν ὅτι μέγας γέγονε Λυκοῦργος καὶ πολλὰ κατώρθωσεν, ἅ οὐκ ἔστι δυνατὸν κατορθῶσαι τὸν μὴ ἀκροασάμενον τῶν λόγων Πλάτωνος.

2. ΙΣΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΠΟΦΑΣΕΙΣ
(*cf.* T 1b; *FGrHist* IV B)

---

55 Λύσιδα ὑμνεῖν *Bernadakis* : Λύσιδι ὕμνον *Wyttenbach* **56** δύντα *Jacobs* : δόντα **56** δόντα κατὰ φθιμένων καὶ σοφῷ ἀθάνατον *Π corr. Diehl* : καὶ σοφῷ *sensu carent* : *dubitat Mau an substituenda* κῦδος’ γ’ *vel* τι κλέος *ut Reiske* **61** τὴν *om. G V M* **61** τέχνην *per del. Bernhardy* **63** τέχνην-ῥητορικήν *om. V* : συνέταξε ῥητορικήν *Suda* Φ 360 *attr. Daub et Gutschmid* **63** Αἰγυπτιακὰ ιβ *Naucratitae vindicaverunt Bernhardy, Daub, Gutschmid* **63** Σικελιακὰ *A G M*; ιβ' *G* ιγ' *vide Jacoby Comm. ad FGrHist 556 T 1a/b* **64** Πρὸς-Ναυκρατέως *Naucrat. attribuerunt Bernhardy, Daub,* Πρὸς-λόγον *Suda* Φ 360 *attribuit Gutschmid* **64** Διονύσου *V* **65** ς', *sed* β' *Gutschmid* **65** βιβλία *om. G* **65** Περὶ τῆς-γ' *Naucratitae attribuerunt omnes* **65** Δημηγορίας *Syracusano attribuit Gutschmid, Suda Φ 360 Daub* **66** Περὶ-Λιβύης *Naucrat. attribuit Gutschmid*

You as a herald have to give birth to an ode on Lysias, which †
although he went down to the world of the dead nevertheless gives
him immortal fame †,
an ode which will show to all men the affection my soul had for my
dear friend, and to all mortals the merits of the deceased.

9 Philistos of Naukratis or Syracuse, son of Archonides. He was a disciple of Euenos the poet of elegies. He was the first to write a history in accordance with the technical devices of rhetoric. He was also the author of a *Treatise on Rhetoric*, of a *History of Egypt* in 12 books and a *History of Sicily* in 11 books, *Against the Three-Headed*, a speech *On Naukratis*, a work *On the Tyrant Dionysios* in 6 books, 3 books *On Egyptian Theology*, *Assembly-Speeches*; and yet other works, e.g. *On Syria and Libya.*

F

1. LIFE OF LYKURGOS (?) OR ON LYKURGOS

1 ... and again Philiskos, describing on the life of Lykurgos, says that Lykurgos became a great man and accomplished many things that are impossible to accomplish for a person who never attended Plato's lectures.

2. COLLECTION OF FAMOUS SAYINGS OF ISOKRATES
(*cf.* T 1b)

1013 (= 337bis). Philiskos of Miletos
(c. 405/400-320/310 B.C.)

Commentary on testimonies and fragments

T

(1-9) Several ancient and Byzantine sources call P. a pupil of Isokrates. Ultimately they all depend on Hellenistic works on the school and pupils of Isokrates (such as the treatise by Hermippos of Smyrna). Through Kaikilios of Kale Akte the source of some remarks in the *vitae X oratorum* by Pseudo-Plutarch can be identified as Hermippos (cf. T 8). The same is true of pieces of information on P. that have been preserved in the biographical lemmata of the *Suda* (cf. T 1a/b; T 6-7; T 9). The same applies also to comments on P. and other disciples of Isokrates in the collection Περὶ τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ διαλαμψάντων compiled by Hesychios of Miletos (cf. T 1a).

P. is also mentioned in an anonymous Βίος Ἰσοκράτους (T 5)[1]. The author of that biography praises P. as one of the most illustrious and famous pupils of Isokrates (οἱ εὐδοκιμήκοτες καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς μαθηταί). Two other pupils of his, Ephoros and Theopompos, are classified together, because they were famous historians, three others, Hypereides, Isaios and Lykurgos, are listed in a second group, because they belong to the "canon" of ten Attic orators. But there is a third subgroup comprising five orators, who apart from their affiliation to the school of Isokrates have no other special quality in common: P. of Miletos, a homonymous orator named Isokrates, Theodektes of Phaselis, Androtion, the author of an *Atthis* and—in the 340s—a political enemy of Demosthenes, and finally Python, the Isocratean orator in the service of king Philip II of Macedon. For one, it is not easy to discern criteria for assigning P., Isokrates, Theodektes, Androtion and Python to this third group. Moreover, if one compares this catalogue of ten with the proud remarks of Isokrates himself[2] about his most important pupils, such as the famous general Timotheos and his colleagues, it is surprising to see that the names of some

[1] The Greek text of T 5 follows the edition of Mathieu – Brémond (1956[2]: XXXV-XXXVI lines 99-106). The anonymous *Life of Isokrates* was also included in the earlier collections of Westermann (1845 = 1964: 257) and of Baiter – Sauppe (1850: 4b l, 22-29).

[2] Cf. Isokr. *Or.* 15,87ff (*Antidosis*-speech) on his disciples.

of his most famous pupils are not mentioned. Obviously, the anonymous author of the *Life of Isokrates* was more interested in men of letters than in the military and political elite of 4th-century Athens, a considerable number of whom were said to have been pupils of Isokrates. As a matter of fact even the three orators in T 5 who were at the same time important Athenian politicians (Hypereides, Lykurgos and Androtion), are in this context primarily regarded as orators and men of letters, because they are grouped together with politically inactive orators such as Isaios.

Scholars have suggested replacing the historian Philistos, whose name appears in our manuscript tradition, by the orator P. of Miletos in two passages of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (T 2-3)[3] and one passage of Cicero (T 4) on the pupils of Isokrates. Jacoby did not include T 2 in the testimonies of the life and works of the historian Philistos[4], because he approved of the conjectures of Göller (in T 2) and Sylburg (in T 3) and followed the wording of the relevant passages adopted by Usener and Radermacher in their edition of Dionysios of Halikarnassos. Only if one accepts the emendation of the name, for which sound reasons have been submitted, can the inclusion of the three passages as T 2-4 of the life and works of P. be justified. Whereas no major objections have been raised to the replacement of the name of Philistos by P. in the two passages of Dionysios of Halikarnassos, most authoritative editors and commentators[5] have refrained from accepting the same procedure for the passage from Cicero (T 4). But neither in the extant volumes of *FGrHist* I-III nor in Jacoby's handwritten notes for *FGrHist* IV A has it been possible for me to find any indication of how the latter would have decided this matter. In order to enable the reader to follow the discussion on P.'s life and works, I have decided (with Blass and others) to include the disputed passage from Cicero as T 4 in this survey of testimonies.

Whereas Lykurgos[6], Hypereides and other prominent pupils of Isokrates are explicitly said to have been "hearers" or pupils of Plato as well, there is no certain evidence that P. was a pupil of the Academy.

---

[3] It may be noted that in the new edition of Dionysios' critical works by Aujac (1978: 172) the reading P. instead of Philistos has been accepted.

[4] Cf. Philistos *FGrHist* 556 T 1-26.

[5] Cf. as a prominent example Wilkins (1892: 274-275).

[6] For Lykurgos as a disciple of Plato cf. Diog. Laert. 3,46 (following Chamaileon); *Suda* Υ 294 *s.v.* Ὑπερίδης; Plut. *Vit. X or.* 841b Mau; Photios *Bibl.* 497 *a*3; see also Renehan (1970: 219-231).

F 1 (= *FGrHist* 337 bis) shows that the orator P. held the philosopher Plato in high esteem. This impression is confirmed by the opening lines of the elegiac poem which P. wrote on the death of the orator Lysias, the older companion of his youth (T 8). From these lines it can be inferred that P. was familiar with the Plato's theology and the doctrine of life after death[7]. As a writer who made some comments on the life of Lykurgos or perhaps as the author of a work *On the Life of Lykurgos* he must have known how deeply Plato had influenced Lykurgos. P. seems to have been sufficiently open-minded to have appreciated the impressive intellectual qualities of Plato, the great opponent of his own teacher Isokrates.

In T 8 P. of Miletos is called a companion of the orator Lysias and a disciple of Isokrates. This is the only ancient testimony that enables us to establish the approximate year of P.'s birth, which must have been ca. 405-400 B.C. P. adduces the doctrines of Plato as the basis for the astonishing political achievements of Lykurgos. Now Lykurgos became a leading Athenian politician only after Chaironeia, but maintained his influence until a few months before his death in 324 B.C. Consequently, P. must have dealt with the years after 338 B.C. and perhaps continued until the death of Lykurgos. In order to do so, P. himself would have had to outlive Lykurgos. This argument leads to 324 B.C. as a first *terminus post quem* for the death of P. of Miletos[8].

Timaios of Tauromenion (T 6) and Neanthes of Kyzikos (T 7) are reported to have been the most famous disciples of P. from the time he became a professional teacher of rhetoric in Athens. It is, however, anything but clear whether the information pertaining to the historian Timaios necessarily leads to a date considerably later than 320 B.C. for P.'s death. Today, the majority of scholars agree with the assumption that Timaios was born ca. 350-340 B.C. He may have come to Athens in his early days on a first visit to improve his education and to study rhetoric under P.[9]. But if one assumes that Timaios did not become a disciple of P., before he was driven by Agathokles into his long-lasting exile in Athens, T 6 would imply that P. died considerably later than 320 B.C. Commenting on this vexed chronological question Jacoby wrote the following: "aber dass die verbannung mit der einnahme Tauromenions zusammenhängt, wird man nicht leicht bezweifeln; und diese wird man doch wohl vor Agatho-

---

7 Cf. Blass (1892²: 453-454).
8 Cf. again Blass (1892²: 453) on the probable dates of P.'s birth and death.
9 This is the assumption of e.g. Susemihl I (1891: 563-564).

kles' erstem feldzug gegen Messana im j. 316/15 datieren"[10]. But we cannot even be certain that Timaios was still living in Sicily in the year Agathokles captured his home-town of Tauromenion. On the basis of our present knowledge it is therefore impossible to determine the exact year in which Timaios went into exile in Athens, an exile that was to last for 50 years. But the brief reference to Neanthes of Kyzikos (T 7)[11] as P.'s pupil dates his death to approximately 320-310 B.C. or slightly later[12].

There is a short passage in the lemma of the *Suda* on P. (= T 1a/b) which states that P. in his early days excelled as a flute-player and that Isokrates for this reason called him αὐλοτρύπης ("flute-borer"). It is a well-known fact that Isokrates' father was the owner of some slaves who produced flutes, and Pollux states that αὐλοτρύπης was used by the writers of comedies as a synonym for αὐλοποιός or producer of flutes[13]. But the reference to P. as a "fluteborer" may have arisen from a joke in a contemporary comedy that was preserved in later biographical tradition on Isokrates and P. Strattis and Aristophanes are reported to have made fun of Isokrates in their plays[14]. Strattis called Isokrates, who at the time was already an elderly man, the "flute-borer" of his young female companion (ἑταῖρα) Lagiska ("the female hare"). The Athenian audience would have understood this joke immediately and laughed at the sexual implications of the expression, which may have been used in an similar context to make fun of P.

---

[10] On the gaps in our knowledge of the exact chronology of Timaios' life, see JACOBY in his commentary on *FGrHist* 566 (III B, p. 530-531; the quotation is taken from p. 531, spelling as in the original); the most important ancient testimony on Timaios' exile is POLYB. 12,25 h 1 = *FGrHist* 566 T 4b = F 34; VATTUONE (1991: 70 and note 18) reviews current scholarly opinion on Timaios' exile in Athens. BROWN and PÉDECH opted for ca. 339-329 B.C., MANNI and JACOBY ca. 316/15, MEISTER proposed 315, and DE SANCTIS preferred a very late date, namely 312 B.C. I prefer to follow with due caution PEARSON (1987: 37 and note 3) and to propose the years ca. 317-315 B.C. as the most likely date for the beginning of Timaios' exile.

[11] Cf. also JACOBYs commentary on *FGrHist* 84 (II C, p. 144).

[12] Cf. SUSEMIHL I (1891: 617-618). It is an established fact that a distinction must be made between two homonymous persons with the name Neanthes of Kyzikos (from the same family?), the older, who was P.'s disciple, and the younger, who became a famous historian of king Attalos I and the author of a work on ἄνδρες ἔνδοξοι (cf. the forthcoming edition and commentary in *FGrHist* IV A 4 1032).

[13] Cf. DION. HALIK. *Isocr.* 1 p. 54 USENER-RADERMACHER, PLUT. *Vita X or.* 836e-f, POLL. 4,71 and PHILOSTR. *Vit. soph.* 1,17,4.

[14] Cf. STRATTIS of Olynthos in the Ἀτάλαντος or Ἀταλάντη (-αι) F 3 KASSEL – AUSTIN = HERMIPPOS F 65 WEHRLI S I from Περὶ Ἰσοκράτους ap. ATHEN. 13,592d and ARISTOPHANES F 722 KASSEL – AUSTIN.

There is no ancient evidence for the thesis that P., who became a metic upon arrival in Athens, was given Athenian citizenship[15] at some point during his long years of study and activity as a teacher of rhetoric. As a metic, P. was in the company of other famous orators of his time (e.g. Lysias, Deinarchos) who were denied the right to participate in Athenian political life and to become full members of the citizen-elite of ῥήτορες καὶ στρατηγοί. Still, he seems to have achieved considerable success as a professional writer of speeches and teacher of rhetoric.

An elegiac poem on the death of his older companion, the famous orator Lysias, is P.'s earliest attested work (T 8). While Bergk had serious doubts on chronological grounds that a companion of the famous orator Lysias (who died soon after 380 B.C.) and the P. who wrote on the life of Lykurgos (who died in 324 B.C.) could be one and the same person, it is unnecessary to assume the existence of two different people named Lysias or of someone with a similar name such as the Pythagorean Lysis, as several scholars have proposed[16].

Among his rhetorical writings the bio-bibliographical lemma in the *Suda* (= T 1b)[17] lists two speeches entitled respectively Μιλησιακός and Ἀμφικτυονικός λόγος. No fragments have been preserved. Thus we cannot establish which rhetorical genre the speeches may have belonged to. Judging from the short titles, and given that the famous orations of Isokrates may have served as P.'s models, one might suppose that P.'s Μιλησιακός and Ἀμφικτυονικός λόγος were epideictic or deliberative speeches. Perhaps both speeches, following the Isocratean tradition, were only political pamphlets and were never actually delivered before an audience. It is impossible to give approximate dates of composition for them. Of course P. may himself have given the speeches before the Milesian assembly. But if the two speeches were written at a later date, when P. was living in Athens as a metic,

---

15 Hence P. is not found on the "check list of naturalized citizens" of OSBORNE IV (1983: 210-221) nor in his "index of names" (1983: 233).

16 Cf. the notes of BERGK (1914³: 640-641), WEST (1992²: 94-95), CUVIGNY (1981: 202-203) and FOWLER (1960: 368) ad PLUT. *Vit. X or.* 836c. WYTTENBACH and FOWLER claimed that the word *Lysias* was inadmissible in the Greek metre.

17 T 1 was included by JACOBY in an appendix on histories of Miletos as *FGrHist* 496 F 9. In his commentary on *FGrHist* 496 F 9 (III B, p. 414) he gave no reasons for his decision and did not comment on P.'s life and works, but confined himself to a short reference to BLASS (1892²: 453-454).

the question arises as to the audience to which, the occasion on which and the person by whom the Μιλησιακός and the ᾽Αμφικτυονικός can have been delivered. P., being a metic, could not himself have delivered his Μιλησιακός before the Athenian assembly or council. But he could have written the speech as a λογογράφος for an Athenian citizen. It may be noted that a speech on Milesian affairs would fit in perfectly into the political context of the first years of Alexander's wars (c. 334/3 B.C.), when his "liberation" of the coastal towns of Asia Minor raised the question in mainland Greece as to how these cities would be treated. Similar considerations apply to the ᾽Αμφικτυονικός. But it is thinkable that P. delivered this speech as an Athenian ambassador or advocate before the Amphictyonic council. In ca. 344/3 Hypereides had delivered a Δηλιακός to defend the position of Athens against the Delians before the Amphictyonic council at Delphi. If the ᾽Αμφικτυονικός of P. was not just an epideictic show-piece, but an oration that was actually delivered, we would have to think of some such occasion, perhaps before the constitution of the "League of Corinth" in 338/7 B.C., which deprived the old Amphictyonic council of some of its former political and legal authority.

P. was also the author of a rhetorical manual in two books, a Τέχνη ῥητορική (T 1,3). The purpose of this treatise may have been to teach his own pupils the practical doctrines of Isocratean rhetoric. Dionysios of Halikarnassos (T 3) lists P. with other well-known composers of rhetorical handbooks and with orators who engaged in rhetorical contests (παραγγελμάτων τεχνικῶν συγγραφεῖς καὶ ἀγωνισταὶ λόγων ῥητορικῶν). Again, there are no extant fragments of this handbook. Thus one can only speculate on its date of composition. But it may have been written after the death of Isokrates when P. himself was teaching rhetoric in his own school in Athens. It is clear, in any case, that P.'s Τέχνη ῥητορική belongs to the earliest attested examples of the genre and was nearly contemporary with the more influential works by Anaximenes of Lampsakos and Aristotle.

A lemma in the *Suda* (= T 1b) informs us of another work entitled Ἰσοκράτους ἀπόφασις. As no fragments have been preserved, scholarly opinion is free to make proposals on the title and genre of this work. From the various suggestions that have been made, that of Blass seems most attractive. The latter wished to alter the manuscript text fractionally by reading ἀποφάσεις for ἀπόφασις, both of which were pronounced identically in imperial Roman and Byzantine times. Ἰσοκράτους ἀποφάσεις makes a perfect book-title. We can envisage a collection of famous sayings by P.'s teacher Isokrates as an early

example of the ᾿Αποφθέγματα-genre[18]. It seems erroneous to interpret the title as it stands in the *Suda* as a letter, treatise or speech, in which P. formally dissociated himself from Isokrates. There is no other hint in our sources that P. ever broke with his teacher. On the contrary, he was remembered as one of his most faithful pupils who perpetuated his rhetorical doctrines.

The confusion between works of the historian Philistos and those of the orator P., which already distorted some passages in Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Cicero, became increasingly worse in the course of time. Hence some scholars[19] have suspected that in the biographical lemma in the *Suda* on the historian Philistos (T 9 deriving from Hesychios) some works have been included which should be attributed to homonymous authors, or even to the orator P. of Miletos, for example, the Δημηγορίαι and the Πρὸς τὸν τρικάρανον (λόγος)[20].

Among those who have proposed ascribing these two works to P. instead of Philistos are Ruhnken and Blass, both leading specialists on Greek oratory. But no decisive argument has hitherto been proposed for ruling out the thesis that the historian Philistos may have been the author of the Δημηγορίαι, real or fictitious assembly-speeches used as material for historical works or in the schools of rhetoric. Solmsen[21] tried to explain the Δημηγορίαι as mere political pamphlets. But in that case one would expect them to be quoted by the *Suda* (or its earlier ancient sources) with their individual titles, as similar works by Isokrates usually were.

The *Suda* credits the historian Philistos with yet another work which modern scholars have ascribed to P. of Miletos, namely an ἀντιγραφή with the telling title Πρὸς τὸν τρικάρανον (λόγος) (= T 9) or *Against the Three-Headed.* But in fact it was Anaximenes of Lampsakos who wrote a treatise with this title which he published under the name of Theopompos of Chios in order to discredit his opponent. It was a political pamphlet and contained satirical attacks against Sparta, Athens and

18 Blass (1892² : 454).

19 Göller (1818) was among the first (with Ruhnken, see below) to suspect that the Δημηγορίαι and the Πρὸς τὸν τρικάρανον, which are both attributed by the *Suda* to Philistos, might be rhetorical works by P. of Miletos.

20 Cf. Ruhnken (1823²: 310-392, esp. 366) who is followed by Blass (1892²: 454 and n. 5).

21 Solmsen (1938: 2386).

Thebes[22]. Serious chronological difficulties arise, if one sticks to the text of the *Suda* and postulates that the historian Philistos, who died in 357 B.C., wrote a second polemical treatise against an earlier pamphlet composed by Anaximenes of Lampsakos. If one admits an error in the article in the *Suda* in regard to the author of the Πρὸς τὸν τρικάρανον, P. of Miletos does indeed become an attractive candidate instead of the historian Philistos. But we should be cautious about ascribing this work with certainty to the Milesian orator. We simply do not know how P. judged the political role of Athens, Sparta and Thebes in the 4th century B.C., and the works of Anaximenes and Theopompos have been preserved only in a fragmentary state.

F

1. LIFE OF LYKURGOS (?) OR ON LYKURGOS

(1) Jacoby included F 1 (*FGrHist* 337bis) only in a provisional form as an addition to volume IIIB. Taking into consideration the biographical character of F 1, one wonders why he chose to place F 1 in his "*Addenda und Corrigenda zu IIIB (Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)—Autoren ueber einzelne Staedte (Laender)*" instead of referring to *FGrHist* part IV on Greek biography. I suspect that he wanted to postpone an extensive commentary on P.'s life and works to *FGrHist* part IV A, as it is missing in *FGrHist* 337bis and *FGrHist* 496 F 9. It is surprising to see that this important fragment is missing in Durrbach's edition of Lykurgos' speeches and fragments in the section on ancient testimonies to the orator's life and works[23]. Conomis does not give it the prominent place it deserves, but hides it in his critical apparatus[24].

In fact Lykurgos is one of the few statesmen of the 4th century B.C., about whom a contemporary author composed a prose work with a biographical passage on the life of Lykurgos or perhaps even a formal βίος. But Lykurgos was also an important man of letters. The work

---

[22] Anaximenes *FGrHist* 72 T 6 and F 20-21; cf. Theopompos *FGrHist* 115 T 10. In Roman times the famous title *Against the Three-Headed* was borrowed by Varro for his satirical attack against the coalition of Caesar, Pompeius and Crassus (App. *Civ.* 2,9).

[23] Durrbach (1956: 1-22).

[24] Conomis (1970: 1-2) app. crit. ad line 8; but see the "testimonia de Lycurgo" Conomis (1970: 1-32).

from which F 1 has been taken is an important testimony to the development of early Greek (political) biography, although the wording of the Greek text (ὁ Φιλίσκος τὸν βίον γράφων τοῦ Λυκούργου, but not ὁ Φιλίσκος ἐν τῷ βιῷ Λυκούργου or a similar phrase) cannot be adduced as sufficient evidence for the formal character of P.'s work. Fortunately Olympiodoros quotes a passage from the work in his commentary on Plato's *Gorgias*, from which we can see that P. stressed the influence of Plato's philosophy on Lykurgos' political achievements and did not limit himself to describing his hero's character. Some modern commentators have also pointed to Platonic influences in Lykurgos' speech *Against Leokrates*[25], which confirm P.'s analysis.

Although only one fragment has been preserved, some conclusions about the composition and scope of the whole biographical treatment of the life of Lykurgos may perhaps be drawn from it. It seems that P. began, like many other early Greek biographers, by pointing out the excellent education Lykurgos enjoyed as a pupil of Isokrates and Plato. It is significant for the quality of P.'s work that he, a prominent pupil of Isokrates, nevertheless stressed Plato's influence on Lykurgos, another well-known pupil of Isokrates. P. deliberately uses some political catchwords in "Lycurgan Athens" such as κατορθοῦν (cf. the noun κατόρθωσις), meaning to accomplish successfully, but at the same time to correct Athenian democracy and in general to set things straight, which summed up many aspects of the so-called political "programme" of Lykurgos between 338 and 324 B.C. The policy of κατορθοῦν was continued and further developed by the slogan ἐπανόρθωσις, a key-word during the reign of Demetrios of Phaleron in Athens (317-307 B.C.).

P. regarded Plato's philosophical teaching as the basis for the astonishing political achievements of Lykurgos in his later years. But if P. wished to prove this thesis, he must have dealt with the later Lykurgos between 338 and 324 B.C. *in extenso*, when the latter had become one of the leading statesmen in Athens together with Demosthenes, Phokion, Hypereides and Demades. Hence it may be assumed that P.'s work was not just confined to the family, early years and education of Lykurgos, but also dwelt on his later political achievements in order to corroborate his view that Plato's philosophy had provided the basis for them.

---

[25] For the speech *Against Leokrates* see Conomis (1970) and Renehan (1970: 219-231).

Some interesting ancient testimonies have been preserved on Lykurgos' influence from 338 to 324 B.C.[26] and on his new position as ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει or head of the financial administration of Athens. Lykurgos' speech in the *Bouleuterion* a short time before his death in 324 B.C., which may have been an important source for P.'s work, can probably be identified with the Ἀπολογισμὸς ὧν πεπολίτευται (F 1-4, and perhaps F 5 CONOMIS). Others have suggested that the Ἀπολογισμός should be regarded as either of the two other attested apologetic court speeches, *Against Demades* or *On the financial administration*[27]. If the ἀπολογισμὸς ὧν πεπολίτευται was not a court speech, but an autobiographical political pamphlet issued by the late Lykurgos or an epideictic speech, in which he defended his whole political career, it may have been the rhetorical pendant to the inscription in which he gave an account of his political acts. This inscription was placed in front of the *Palaistra*, which had been built and equipped by him[28]. Although it is obvious that the speeches and the inscription must be viewed as differing from (auto-)biographies in the strict sense, they will certainly have dealt with a substantial part of Lykurgos' political life and have served as a major source both for contemporary authors such as P. and for later writers of Βίοι Λυκούργου.

The Byzantine patriarch Photios quotes most of his biographical information on Lykurgos in a significantly abridged form from the *Life* of Lykurgos in the *Lives of the Ten Orators*. But Photios on the other hand explicitly speaks of a ἱστορία, that is a "historical"(?) work on Lykurgos[29], as his source. The idealized view of Lykurgos as an honorable citizen, a famous orator and a philosophical statesman, which we find in F 1, points back through Kaikilios of Kale Akte to an early Hellenistic *Life of Lykurgos* or a work *On the Disciples of Isokrates* (e.g. by Hermippos of Smyrna)[30]. According to Momigliano P.'s work on the

---

26 See KIRCHNER (1901-1903) PA 9251, DEVELIN (1989: no. 1832) and DAVIES (1971: 348-353).

27 See for the speeches Περὶ τῆς διοικήσεως and Πρὸς Δημάδην ἀπολογία CONOMIS F 1-2 (1971: p. 98f); on the problems of separating the different attested Lycurgan speeches in defence of his own administration, see also BURTT (1954: 138-139) and MALCOVATI (1966: 24-28). These speeches will be interpreted in a more elaborate way together with similar apologetic and autobiographical orations by Lysias, Isokrates, Demosthenes, Demades and Demetrios of Phaleron in a forthcoming separate paper.

28 Cf. PLUT. *Vit. X or.* 843f: πάντων δ' ὧν διῴκησεν ἀναγραφὴν ποιησάμενος ἀνέθηκεν ἐν στήλῃ πρὸ τῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατασκευασθείσης παλαίστρας.

29 Cf. PHOTIOS *Bibl.* p. 496 b 41 and 497 a 3.

30 Cf. HERMIPPOS *On Isokrates and his disciples* F 64-78 WEHRLI S I = *FGrHist* IV A 3 1026 F 45-54 BOLLANSÉE.

life of Lykurgos was written in the tradition of an Isocratean *encomium* and can be compared with the work on Alexander of Epeiros by Theodektes of Phaselis. But in the *Suda* the latter is explicitly entitled an ἐγκώμιον Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἠπειρώτου[31].

The years from the battle of Chaironeia in 338 B.C. to the end of the "Lamian" or "Hellenic" War are justly called "Lycurgan Athens". This was the last period of large-scale public building activity organized and financed by the independent polis of Athens. Archaeologists and historians of Greek art regard these years as the final years of classical Greek art. Whereas ancient historians in the late 19th and early 20th centuries emphasized the importance of the battle of Chaironeia as a decisive year in Athenian history, after which a tedious period of Athenian political dependence and intellectual degeneration in the shadow of Macedon followed, recent scholarship has on the contrary stressed the unbroken intensity of democratic political and cultural life until at least 322 B.C. "Lycurgan Athens" was in many respects—including military power—a period of prosperity and growing strength for Athens. Lykurgos himself combined realism and pragmatism in Athenian foreign policy with a political vision of the historically legitimized greatness of his native city, unquestioned personal integrity and admirable intellectual capacity as an orator[32]. These personal and political qualities were already acknowledged by his contemporaries. P. of Miletos presumably bore testimony to their judgement in his work on the life of Lykurgos.

2. COLLECTION OF FAMOUS SAYINGS OF ISOKRATES (*cf.* T 1b)

Johannes ENGELS

[31] Cf. MOMIGLIANO (1993: 64 and n. 21); but see RADERMACHER (1951: 202f) on Theodektes; PERNOT (1993) did not include P.'s work on the life of Lykurgos as an early *encomium*.

[32] There exists extensive scholarly literature on Lykurgos and on the historical evaluation of Lycurgan Athens. See MITCHEL (1973: 163-214), WILL (1983), HUMPHREYS (1985: 199-252), ENGELS (1992: 5-29), ENGELS (1993²), FARAGUNA (1992), EDER (1995), HABICHT (1995: 19-47), HINTZEN – BOHLEN (1997) and WIRTH (1997: 191-225).

Text editions and translations

A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon (Lexicographi Graeci* I), III, Leipzig 1933 (= Stuttgart 1967); IV, Leipzig 1935 (= Stuttgart 1971).

G. Aujac, *Denys d'Halicarnasse. Opuscules rhétoriques,* I. *Les orateurs antiques* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1978.

G. Baiter – H. Sauppe, *Oratores Attici,* II, Turici 1850.

Th. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), II, Leipzig 1914^{3}.

F. Blass, *Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1899.

J.O. Burtt, *Minor Attic Orators*, II. *Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades, Hyperides* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge (Mass.) - London 1954 (= 1980).

N.C. Conomis, *Lycurgi oratio in Leocratem cum ceterarum Lycurgi orationum fragmentis* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1970.

M. Cuvigny, *Plutarque Œuvres morales, XII,1* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1981.

E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, I^{3} (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1949-1952.

F. Durrbach, *Lycurgue contre Léocrate. Fragments* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1956.

H.N. Fowler, *Plutarch's Moralia, X (771e-854d)* (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1936 (= 1960).

R. Henry, *Photius Bibliothèque, VIII (Codices 257-280)* (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1977.

C. Jensen, *Hyperidis orationes sex cum ceterarum fragmentis* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1917 (= Stuttgart 1963).

R. Kassel – C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci*, VII. *Menecrates-Xenophon*, Berlin - New York 1989.

J.J. Keaney, *Harpocration. Lexeis of the Ten Orators*, Amsterdam 1991.

E. Malcovati, *Licurgo. Orazione contro Leocrate e frammenti* (Classici Latini e Greci), Roma 1966.

G. Mathieu – E. Brémond, *Isocrate Discours,* I (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 1956^{2}.

J. Mau, *Plutarchus Moralia, V 2,1* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1971.

C. Müller – V. Langlois, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, I-V,1-2, Paris 1841-1872.

L. Radermacher, *Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)* (Österr. Akad. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. SB 227,3), Wien 1951.

C.J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander. The dated laws & decrees of the "lykourgan era" 338-322 B.C.*, Chicago 1985.

E.W. Sutton – H. Rackham, *Cicero De oratore,* I, *books I,II*, (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge (Mass.)-London 1942 (= 1976 with modifications).

H. Usener – L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant,* V. *opusculorum vol. prius* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1899.

St. Usher, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The critical essays in two volumes,* II (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge (Mass.) - London 1985.

F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar,* Suppl. I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer,* Basel - Stuttgart 1974.

M.L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati,* II, Oxford 1992^2.

L.G. Westerink, *Olympiodori in Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1970.

A. Westermann, *Βιογράφοι. Vitarum scriptores minores*, Braunschweig 1845 (= Amsterdam 1964).

A.S. Wilkins, *Cicero, De oratore libri tres, with introduction and notes*, Oxford 1892 (= Hildesheim 1965).

Secondary literature

F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit, zweite Abtheilung: Isokrates und Isaios*, Leipzig 1982^2.

J. Bleicken, *Die athenische Demokratie*, Paderborn 1994^2.

N.C. Conomis, *Notes on the Fragments of Lycurgus*, in *Klio* 39 (1961) p. 72-152.

J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.

W. Eder (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?*, Stuttgart 1995.

J. Engels, *Zur Stellung Lykurgs im Verfassungsrahmen der späten Demokratie und zur Aussagekraft des sogenannten Lykurgischen Militär- und Bauprogramms für die Demokratie vor 322 v. Chr.*, in *AncSoc* 23 (1992) p. 5-29.

J. Engels, *Studien zur politischen Biographie des Hypereides. Athen in der Epoche der lykurgischen Reformen und des makedonischen Universalreiches*, München 1993^2.

M. Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro. Problemi politici, economici, finanziari*, Roma 1992.

F. Göller, *De situ et origine Syracusarum ad explicandum Thucydidis potiss. hist. scripsit atque Philisti et Timaei rerum sicularum fragmenta adiecit*, Leipzig 1818.

Chr. Habicht, *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*, München 1995.

M.H. Hansen, *Die Athenische Demokratie im Zeitalter des Demosthenes. Struktur, Prinzipien und Selbstverständnis*, Berlin 1995.

B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Kulturpolitik des Eubulos und des Lykurg. Die Denkmäler- und Bauprojekte in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.*, Berlin 1997.

S. Humphreys, *Lycurgus of Boutadae: An Athenian Aristocrat*, in J.W. Eadie – J. Ober (ed.), *The Craft of the Athenian Historian, Essays in Honor of Ch.G. Starr*, Lanham (New York) - London 1985, p. 199-252.

F.W. Mitchel, *Lykurgan Athens: 338-322 B.C.*, Cincinnati 1973, p. 163-214.

M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens,* 4 vol., Bruxelles 1981-1983.

L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and His Predecessors*, Atlanta 1987.

L. Pernot, *La Rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain,* Paris 1993.

R.F. Renehan, *The Platonism of Lykurgos*, in *GRBS* 11 (1970) p. 219-231.

D. Ruhnken, *Historia critica oratorum Graecorum ex editione Rutilii Lupi,* in *Davidis Ruhnkenii Opuscula varii argumenti, oratoria, historica, critica,* I, Leiden 1823^2.

F. Solmsen, art. *Philiskos* (9), in *RE* 18,2 (1938), col. 2384-2387.

R. Vattuone, *Sapienza d'occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenion*, Bologna 1991.
W. Will, *Athen und Alexander. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Stadt von 338-322 v. Chr.*, München 1983.
G. Wirth, *Lykurg und Athen im Schatten Philipps II.*, in W. Eder – K.-J. Hölkeskamp (ed.), *Volk und Verfassung im vorhellenistischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 1997, p. 191-225.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX LOCORUM

1. *Literary sources*

2. *Epigraphical and papyrological sources*

CONCORDANCES

Antisthenes FGrHist IV A 1 1004:

Concordance of *FGrHist* IV A 1, Decleva Caizzi and Giannantoni:

FGrHist IV A 1	Decleva Caizzi	Giannantoni V A
T 1	F 1	41
T 2	F 43	204
T 3	F 42	203
T 4	F 6	43
F 1	F 30	198
F 2	F 31	201
F 3a	F 32A	199
F 3b	F 32B	199
F 4	F 33	200
F 5a	F 29A	141
F 5b	F 29B	141
F 6	F 34	142
F 7a	F 35	143
F 7b	—	143
F 7c	—	144

Phainias of Eresos FGrHist IV A 1 1012:
Concordance of Wehrli and *FGrHist* IV A 1:

FGrHist IV A 1	Wehrli
T 1	F 1
T 2	F 2
T 3	F 3
T 4	F 4
T 5	F 5
T 6	F 6
T 7	F 7
F 1	F 11
F 2	F 13
F 3	F 14
F 4	F 15
F 5	F 16
F 6	Hermippos F 89
F 7	F 17a-b
F 8	F 18
F 9	F 19
F 10	F 33
F 11	F 30
F 12	F 31
F 13	F 32
F 14	F 20
F 15	F 21
F 16a-b	F 22a-b
F 17	F 23
F 18	F 24
F 19	F 25
F 20	F 26
F 21	F 27
F 22	F 28
F 23	F 29